

North Dakota 21st Century Community Learning Centers



Statewide Evaluation 2012-2013 School Year

**Prepared by:
Westwood Research & Statistical Services
Bismarck North Dakota
April 2014**

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	9
Methodology/Report Format.....	10
Executive Summary.....	13
State Mandated Objectives/Progress.....	24
Recommendations for Program Improvement.....	29
Data Reporting and Interpretation Considerations.....	33
Table 1.....	34
Grantees by Location and Number of Centers, 2012-2013	
Table 2.....	35
Attendance by Gender and Attendee Status, 2012-2013	
Table 3.....	36
Attendance by Racial/Ethnic Group and Attendee Status, 2012-2013	
Table 4.....	37
Attendance by Grade Level and Attendee Status, 2012-2013	
Table 5.....	38
Attendees Participating in Special Services or Programs by Special Service or Program and Attendee Status, 2012-2013	
Table 6.....	39
Grantee Activity or Services Offered by Category of Activity or Service and Mean, 2012-2013	

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table 7.....	40
Grantee Centers Offering Activities or Services Focusing on a Given Academic Subject by Academic Subject, 2012-2013	
Table 8.....	41
Grantee Centers with Activities or Services Targeting a Given Population, 2012-2013	
Table 9.....	42
Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Core Academic Areas (Mathematics, Reading/Literacy, Science, and Technology/Computer) by Grantee, 2012-2013	
Table 10.....	50
Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Enrichment and Support Activities (Arts/Music, Cultural/Social Studies, Health/Nutrition, and Other) by Grantee, 2012-2013	
Table 11.....	58
Total Attendees and Free/Reduced Meal Attendees by Grantee, 2012-2013	
Table 12.....	59
Mean Programming Hours per Week, Before Day School, During Day School, After Day School, and Weekend by Grantee, 2012-2013	
Table 13a.....	67
Paid and Volunteer Staff by Type and Percent of Type, 2012-2013	
Table 13b.....	68
Paid and Volunteer Staff by Type and Percent Paid/Volunteer, 2012-2013	
Table 14.....	69
Partners/Subcontractors by Contribution Type, 2012-2013	

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table 15.....	70
Type of Partner by Contribution, 2012-2013	
Table 16.....	71
MAP Math and MAP Reading Mean Scores and Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported Scores by Test Timeframe and Test Type, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013	
Table 17.....	72
State Assessment Math Scores and Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported Proficiencies by Test Timeframe, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013	
Table 18.....	73
State Assessment Reading Scores and Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported Proficiencies by Test Timeframe, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013	
Table 19a.....	74
Teacher Survey Results (YouthServices.net) by Individual Question, 2012-2013 To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of: Turning in homework on time	
Table 19b.....	75
Teacher Survey Results (YouthServices.net) by Individual Question, 2012-2013 To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of: Completing homework to your (teachers) satisfaction	
Table 19c.....	76
Teacher Survey Results (YouthServices.net) by Individual Question, 2012-2013 To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of: participating in class	
Table 19d.....	77
Teacher Survey Results (YouthServices.net) by Individual Question, 2012-2013 To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of: volunteering in class	

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table 19e.....	78
Teacher Survey Results (YouthServices.net) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of: attending class regularly	
Table 19f.....	79
Teacher Survey Results (YouthServices.net) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of: being attentive in class	
Table 19g.....	80
Teacher Survey Results (YouthServices.net) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of: behaving well in class	
Table 19h.....	81
Teacher Survey Results (YouthServices.net) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of: performing well academically	
Table 19i.....	82
Teacher Survey Results (YouthServices.net) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of: coming to school motivated to learn	
Table 19j.....	83
Teacher Survey Results (YouthServices.net) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of: getting along well with other students	
Table 20a.....	84
Teacher Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
I have a good understanding of the goals of the after-school program	
Table 20b.....	85
Teacher Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
I have a good understanding about the after-school program expectations of my contributions.	

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table 20c.....	86
Teacher Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
Program staff communicates regularly with school day staff to inform us about program operations.	
Table 20d.....	87
Teacher Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
Program staff communicates regularly with school day staff to receive information about student progress.	
Table 20e.....	88
Teacher Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
The program activities addressing academic and behavioral needs of the students are well designed.	
Table 20f.....	89
Teacher Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
The program activities addressing academic and behavioral needs of students are implemented effectively.	
Table 21a.....	90
Parent Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
What are the most important reasons for having your child participate in the after-school program?	
Table 21b.....	91
Parent Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
As a result of participating in the after-school program, my child's reading skills have improved?	
Table 21c.....	92
Parent Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
As a result of participating in the after-school program, my child's math skills have improved?	
Table 21d.....	93
Parent Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
As a result of participating in the after-school program, my child's attitude towards school has improved?	

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table 21e.....	94
Parent Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
The after-school program provides a safe setting for my child to participate in activities?	
Table 21f.....	95
Parent Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
Overall, I am very satisfied with the after-school program for which my child participates?	
Table 21g.....	96
Parent Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
Overall, my child is very satisfied with the after-school program?	
Table 22.....	97
Student Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
Has the after school program helped you improve your reading? Has the after-school program helped you improve your math skills?	
Do you like attending the after-school program?	
Table 23a.....	98
Partner Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
I have a good understanding of the goals of the after-school program?	
Table 23b.....	99
Partner Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
I have a good understanding about after-school program expectations of my contributions?	
Table 23c.....	100
Partner Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
Project director communicates regularly with me regarding progress of the project?	

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table 23d.....	101
Partner Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
Project director communicates regularly with me regarding the impact of my contributions?	
Table 23e.....	102
Partner Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
The after-school program is viewed as a helpful resource to families in the community?	
Table 23f.....	103
Partner Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
We work together to effectively coordinate services for children, youth, and/or families?	
Table 23g.....	104
Partner Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
The after-school program is a significant asset in our community?	
Table 23h.....	105
Partner Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2012-2013	
How does your organization contribute to the after-school program?	
Table 24.....	106
Centers Serving Improvement Schools by Grantee and Improvement School, 2012-2013	
Table 25a.....	110
Mean Scores by Monitoring and Quality Improvement Tool (MQIT) Category, 2012-2013	
Table 25b.....	111
Mean Scores for Grants Management and Sustainability by Performance Measure (Best Practice), 2012-2013	
Table 25c.....	112
Mean Scores for Grantee Program Management by Performance Measure (Best Practice), 2012-2013	

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table 25d.....	113
Mean Scores for Grantee Staffing and Professional Development by Performance Measure (Best Practice), 2012-2013	
Table 25e.....	114
Mean Scores for Grantee Partnerships by Performance Measure (Best Practice), 2012-2013	
Table 25f.....	115
Mean Scores for Grantee Center Operations by Performance Measure (Best Practice), 2012-2013	
Table 25g.....	116
Mean Scores for Grantee Programming/Activities by Performance Measure (Best Practice), 2012-2013	
Table 25h.....	117
Mean Scores for Grantee Health and Safety by Performance Measure (Best Practice), 2012-2013	
Table 25i.....	118
Mean Scores for Grantee Evaluation/Measuring Outcomes by Performance Measure (Best Practice), 2012-2013	

Introduction

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program (CCLC), as authorized under Title IV, Part B, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, emphasizes: (1) opportunities for academic enrichment, including tutorial services to help students (particularly students in high-poverty areas and those who attend low-performing schools) meet State and local student performance standards in core academic subjects such as reading, mathematics and science; (2) offers students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities, such as youth development activities; drug and violence prevention programs; counseling programs; art, music, and recreation programs; technology education programs; and character education programs, all designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students; and (3) extends families of students attending community learning centers opportunities for literacy and related educational development.¹

The federally funded North Dakota CCLC program is administered by the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction (NDDPI) and operated locally through grants awarded by the NDDPI. The State's CCLC programs support out-of-school (before-school and/or after-school) programming for K-12 students, emphasizing services to those attending high-poverty or Title I (school-wide) schools across the state. In July 2008 the NDDPI awarded eight operational grants for a period of three years each. The eight grantees, all Regional Educational Associations, are located throughout the state.

To measure the effectiveness of these CCLC funded programs and activities, State Education Agencies are required to conduct comprehensive evaluations in addition to identifying performance indicators and measures used to evaluate programs. Each grantee must undergo a periodic evaluation to assess its progress toward achieving the goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment. Results of the evaluation must be: (1) used to refine, improve, and strengthen the program and to refine the performance measures; and (2) made available to the public upon request.

North Dakota's CCLC program evaluation framework is based on a continuum emphasizing incremental progress.² Accountability, the first level of the evaluation process, calls attention to basic documentation with regard to program implementation and operations, specifically: (1) adherence to proposal and federal regulations (compliance) and (2) documentation examining staffing patterns, student attendance and eligibility, service hours, and program activities offered.

¹ 21st Century Community Learning Centers; Non-Regulatory Guidance. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Programs, February 2003. Retrieved January 19, 2011 from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/21stcclc/guidance2003.doc>

² Evaluation Plan of 21st Century Community Learning Centers, April 2008, prepared by DMD Consulting, Grand Forks ND.

Introduction (Continued)

Process outcomes, the second level of the evaluation process, emphasize results by documenting the accomplishment of activities related to program implementation and operation. These outcomes focus on the level of success and/or quality related to the implementation, management and ongoing operations of an activity. It includes documentation of program records, combined with methodologies such as surveys, interviews, and focus groups, etc.

Impact, the third level of the evaluation process, measures the effects and/or outcomes of program activities, ideally with direct links to program activities. These outcomes should offer meaningful findings including: (1) increased student achievement and (2) positive changes in student behavior.

Sustainability, the fourth and final level of the evaluation process, refers to program continuity focused on securing continued funding. In a broader view it encompasses various strategies to maintain the essentials of the program responsible for its positive impact.

This document presents an evaluation of the North Dakota CCLC program for 2012-2013 and focuses on program attendance, activities/services, center operations, staffing, partnerships, assessments, teacher survey results, parent survey results, student survey results, partner survey results, and program strengths and opportunities for improvement. In addition, it identifies and measures progress toward State mandated objectives, specifically: (1) participants in CCLC programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes; (2) CCLC will offer a range of high-quality educational, developmental and recreational services; and (3) CCLC will serve children and family members with the greatest needs for expanded learning opportunities.

Methodology/Report Format

North Dakota's CCLC program evaluation was conducted in two phases; qualitative, which included site visits to each of North Dakota's eight grantees, including 15 centers (schools); and quantitative, incorporating an analysis of the grantees program information. During the qualitative phase a standardized set of quality indicators was used to assess CCLC programs in terms of general program implementation, operations, and compliance with federal regulations. This standardized set of quality indicators provides grantees and stakeholders a uniform means for identifying challenges, strengths, and opportunities for improvement.

Methodology/Report Format (Continued)

The standardized set of quality indicators employed in this phase, the Colorado Department of Education's Monitoring and Quality Improvement Tool (MQIT), was specifically designed for CCLC programs and (1) serves as a self-assessment tool to improve the quality of CCLC programs and (2) serves as a monitoring tool for the NDDPI.³

The MQIT is organized into eight categories:

- A. Grant Management and Sustainability
- B. Program Management
- C. Staffing and Professional Development
- D. Partnerships
- E. Center Operations
- F. Programming/Activities
- G. Health and Safety
- H. Evaluation/Measuring Outcomes

Section A addresses the grantees' performance level with regard to individual grant requirements while sections B through H addresses program quality in a broader sense.

During the grantee-specific site visits each of the MQIT's standardized set of quality indicators is examined by the State CCLC Program Evaluator and the grantee (two to four hours). Afterwards, visits are made to two or three randomly selected centers to further assess the CCLC's out-of-school day programs/activities/infrastructure and interactions between student and teacher/staff (approximately one hour).

Subsequently, the State CCLC Program Evaluator, as evidenced by documentation provided by the grantee and center-specific site visits, arrives at a rating (score) for each of the standardized set of quality indicators and an overall rating (score). In addition, the State CCLC Program Evaluator, identifies strengths and opportunities for improvement, and if appropriate, recommends plans of action and timeframes for completion of "lower" rated quality indicators. Any questions regarding the results of the evaluation are addressed by the State CCLC Program Evaluator and grantee.

During the quantitative phase of the CCLC program evaluation, program attendance; activities/services; center operations; program objectives; staffing; partnerships; assessments; and teacher, parent, student, and partner survey information is assembled and analyzed.

³ Colorado 21st Century Community Learning Center Monitoring and Quality Improvement Tool. Retrieved March 8, 2010 from http://elo.ccsso.org/alfresco/d/d/workspace/SpacesStore/385e4496-cb7f-11dd-84ce-1bf8a914463c/CO_21stCCLCmonitoringtool07final.pdf

Information used in this phase is provided by the grantees via Cityspan (YouthServices.net), the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS), and SurveyMonkey.

YouthServices.net, a data entry/report generating software program, records key information for each participant including name, address, school, emergency contacts, demographics, and tracks participants and services and their participation in program activities. In addition, the software also manages information about staff, partnering agencies, and facilities. A vast majority of the YouthServices.net information is uploaded to PPICS which allows for grantee and state data outcome comparisons. In addition teacher, parent, student, and partner surveys are conducted via YouthServices.net and/or SurveyMonkey.

This report consists of a bulleted executive summary of quantitative and qualitative results, measurements of progress made toward reaching North Dakota's mandated objectives, program strengths and opportunities for improvement, recommendations for program improvement, data reporting and interpretation considerations, and detailed descriptive tables.

When reviewing and interpreting the information contained in this report, the reader should be cognizant of specific data limitations. These are addressed in the "Data Reporting and Interpretation Considerations" section of the report.

Executive Summary

Grantees

1. North Dakota's eight grantees which include 80 centers (schools) are located throughout the state, specifically: Williston, Minot, Mandan, Bottineau, Devils Lake, Dickinson, Grand Forks, and Fargo. All grantees are Regional Educational Associations. (Table 1).

Program Attendance

1. Of the 8,529 unduplicated attendees reported statewide, 61.5% (5,249) were regular attendees (30+ days) while 38.5% (3,280) attended less than 30 days. (Table 2).
2. More than half (54.2%) were "White", 32.5% "American Indian/Alaskan Native", and 4.8% "Hispanic/Latino." (Table 3).
3. Approximately two-thirds (66.3%) were enrolled in grades one through five. (Table 4).
4. More than six in ten (61.0%) attendees participated in the "Free and Reduced Lunch Program (FRLP)", 6.1% in the "Limited English Proficiency (LEP)" special services/programs, and 11.4% in "special needs" services/programs. (Table 5).

Activities/Services

1. Nearly all (98.8%) of the reporting centers provided "academic enrichment learning programs", 91.3% "homework help", 66.3% "recreational activities", and 35.0% "tutoring." (Table 6).
2. More than one-third (37.5%) of reporting centers specified family members attended "promotion of parental involvement", 21.3% "promotion of family literacy", while 8.8% reported family members attended "career/job training for adults." (Table 6).
3. All reporting centers provided "reading/literacy education activities" and "mathematics education activities", 97.5% "science education activities", 83.8% "health/nutrition related activities", 65.0% "cultural activities/social studies", 80.0% "telecommunications and technology education activities", and 76.3% "arts and music education activities." (Table 7).

Executive Summary (Continued)

4. A sizable majority (79.0%) of reporting centers targeted “students not performing at grade level”, 22.2% “LEP”, 16.0% “truant students”, 37.0% “students with special needs”, and 23.5% indicated targeting “other student populations.” (Table 8).
5. Approximately three-fourths (77.9% or 53) of reporting centers indicated that more than 65.0% of their total hours involved the core academic areas of mathematics, reading/literacy, science, and technology/computer, while the remaining centers (22.1% or 15) reported 65.0% or less of their hours related to the core academic areas. Statewide, 73.9% (36,775.0) of the total 49,766.0 hours of programming involved the core academic areas. (Table 9).
6. Nearly all (97.1% or 68) of reporting centers indicated providing enrichment activities; only one reported not providing such activities. (Table 10).
7. Nearly all (95.0% or 76) of reporting centers served attendees that met or exceeded 40% free/reduced meals, while four did not specify whether they met the criteria. (Table 11).

Center Operations

1. More than three-fourths (82.1% or 64) of all centers reported a mean number of hours per week as 15 or more, while 17.9% or 14 reported a mean of less than 15 hours per week. (Table 12).

Staffing

1. Of the 1,073 total paid and volunteer staff, 33.5% were “school-day teachers”, 20.5% “college students”, and 14.0% “high school students.” (Table 13a).
2. Of the 309 “school-day teachers”, 99.4% were paid; 79.1% of the “college students” paid, 38.7% of “high school students” paid, while 98.8% of the “center administrators and coordinators” were paid. (Table 13b).

Executive Summary (Continued)

Partnerships

1. Types of partners were wide-ranging and included Clubs, College or Universities, Community-Based Organizations, Faith-Based Organizations, For-Profit Entities, Health Based Organizations, Libraries, Museums, Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agencies, Other Units of City/County Government, Park/Recreation Districts, Regional/Intermediate Education Agencies, School Districts, United States Department of Interior-Bureau of Indian Affairs, and YMCA's/YWCA's. All grantees partnered with at least one organization. (Table 15).
2. Of the 152 partnerships reported statewide, 62.5% contributed "programming/activity-related services", 60.5% "goods/materials", 33.6% "paid staffing", and 26.3% "volunteer staffing." (Table 14).
3. Total estimated monetary value of contributions by partners was \$1,538,572.00, or a mean estimated monetary value of \$10,122.18 per partner. Regarding subcontractors, the total estimated monetary value held by the 15 subcontractors was \$1,397,377.00, or a mean estimated monetary value of \$93,158.47 per subcontractor. (Table 14 and 15).
4. Of the total amount contributed by partners, 55.1% (\$847,921.00) was provided by "school districts." (Table 15).

Assessments

1. Mean fall MAP math scores were relatively constant throughout the 2008-09 to 2012-13 school years. During that time period, the mean scores rose slightly, from 193.2 in 2008-09 to 195.2 in 2012-13. Mean spring MAP math scores were also relatively constant throughout the 2008-09 to 2012-13 school years. During that time period, the scores rose slightly, from 201.3 in 2008-09 to 203.2 in 2012-13. Generally, mean scores were higher in the spring of each school year. (Table 16).
2. Mean fall MAP reading scores were relatively constant throughout the 2008-09 to 2012-13 school years. During that time period, the mean scores declined somewhat, from 198.4 in 2008-09 to 190.2 in 2012-13. Mean spring MAP reading scores were also relatively constant throughout the 2008-09 to 2012-13 school years. During that time period, the scores rose slightly, from 196.4 in 2008-09 to 197.4 in 2012-13. Generally, mean scores were higher in the spring of each school year. (Table 16).
3. With respect to state assessment math proficiencies, in 2008-09, 73.7% of attendees were "advanced" or "proficient" compared to 72.9% during the 2012-13 timeframe. (Table 17).

Executive Summary (Continued)

4. With respect to state assessment reading proficiencies, in 2008-09, 69.0% of attendees were “advanced” or “proficient” compared to 66.4% during the 2012-13 timeframe. (Table 18).

Teacher Survey Results (YouthServices.net)

1. 5,261 surveys were distributed to center teachers, of which 60.1% (3,163) were completed and returned. (Table 19a).
2. In the teacher’s opinion, 1,816 attendees needed to improve their behavior in terms of “turning in homework on time”, of those, 62.9% “showed improvement”, 29.1% exhibited “no change”, while 8.0% “showed a decline.” (Table 19a).
3. Of the 1,905 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “completing their homework to the teachers satisfaction”, teachers indicated 64.6% “showed improvement”, 26.1% displayed “no change”, while 9.2% “showed a decline.” (Table 19b).
4. Of the 1,849 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “participating in class”, 59.8% “showed improvement”, 35.0% exhibited “no change”, while 5.2% “showed a decline.” (Table 19c).
5. Of the 1,742 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “volunteering in class”, 37.6% “showed improvement”, 59.8% displayed “no change”, while 2.6% “showed a decline.” (Table 19d).
6. Of the 1,116 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “attending class regularly”, 34.1% “showed improvement”, 58.2% exhibited “no change”, while 7.8% “showed a decline.” (Table 19e).
7. Of the 1,993 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “being attentive in class”, 51.5% “showed improvement”, 37.6% displayed “no change”, while 10.9% “showed a decline.” (Table 19f).
8. Of the 1,788 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “behaving well in class”, 47.4% “showed improvement”, 39.2% exhibited “no change”, while 13.4% “showed a decline.” (Table 19g).

Executive Summary (Continued)

9. Of the 2,114 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “performing well academically”, 67.9% “showed improvement”, 24.2% displayed “no change”, while 7.9% “showed a decline.” (Table 19h).
10. Of the 1,732 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “coming to school motivated to learn”, 51.2% “showed improvement”, 41.3% exhibited “no change”, while 7.4% “showed a decline.” (Table 19i).
11. Of the 1,658 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “getting along well with other students”, 47.6% “showed improvement”, 41.5% displayed “no change”, while 10.9% “showed a decline.” (Table 19j).

Teacher Survey Results (SurveyMonkey)

1. Of the 617 teacher surveys completed, 84.1% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “teachers have a good understanding of the goals of the after-school program”, 3.9% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 12.0% were “not sure.” (Table 20a).
2. 77.1% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “teachers have a good understanding about the after-school program expectations of my (teacher) contributions”, 5.5% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 17.3% were “not sure.” (Table 20b).
3. 64.7% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “program staff communicate regularly with school day staff to inform us (teachers) about program operations”, 15.2% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 17.3% were “not sure.” (Table 20c).
4. 61.8% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “program staff communicate regularly with school day staff to receive information about student progress”, 19.0% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 19.3% were “not sure.” (Table 20d).
5. 72.1% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “program activities addressing academic and behavioral needs of the students are well designed”, 6.6% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 21.2% were “not sure.” (Table 20e).
6. 67.9% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “program activities addressing academic and behavioral needs of students are implemented effectively”, 7.6% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 24.5% were “not sure.” (Table 20f).

Executive Summary (Continued)

Parent Survey Results (SurveyMonkey)

1. Of the 1,123 parent surveys completed, “the most important reasons for having their child participate in the after-school program” were: “helps with childcare” (2.69), “safe setting” (2.70), “improves academic performance” (2.93), “improves attitude towards school” (3.27), and “improves behavior in and out of school” (3.41), respectively. (Note: 1 denotes “most important” while 5 “least important”). (Table 21a).
2. 74.1% of parents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “as a result of participating in the after-school program, the child's reading skills have improved”, 3.9% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 22.0% were “not sure.” (Table 21b).
3. 69.6% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “as a result of participating in the after-school program, the child's math skills have improved”, 4.0% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 26.4% were “not sure.” (Table 21c).
4. 75.5% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “as a result of participating in the after-school program, the child's attitude towards school has improved”, 4.5% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 20.0% were “not sure.” (Table 21d).
5. 97.6% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the after-school program provides a safe setting for the child to participate in activities”, 0.9% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 1.5% were “not sure.” (Table 21e).
6. 96.8% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “overall, the parent(s) is very satisfied with the after-school program for which the child participates”, 1.8% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 1.4% were “not sure.” (Table 21f).
7. 94.3% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “overall, the child is very satisfied with the after-school program”, 2.8% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 2.9% were “not sure.” (Table 21g).

Student Survey Results (SurveyMonkey)

1. Of the 2,678 responses to the question: “Has the after school program helped you improve your reading?”, 63.6% of the students indicated “yes”, 22.5% responded “no”, while 13.9% were “not sure.” (Table 22).

Executive Summary (Continued)

2. Of the 2,665 responses to the question: “Has the after-school program helped you improve your math skills?”, 67.4% of the students indicated “yes”, 15.0% responded “no”, while 17.6% were “not sure.” (Table 22).
3. Of the 2,663 responses to the question: “Do you like attending the after-school program?”, 76.5% of the students indicated “yes”, 10.8% responded “no”, while 12.7% were “not sure.” (Table 22).

Partner Survey Results (SurveyMonkey)

1. Of the 58 completed partner surveys, 98.3% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the partner has a good understanding of the goals of the after-school program”, none “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 1.7% were “not sure.” (Table 23a).
2. 96.6% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the partner has a good understanding about after-school program expectations of the partner’s contributions”, none “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 3.4% were “not sure.” (Table 23b).
3. 87.9% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the project director communicates regularly with the partner regarding progress of the project”, 1.7% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 10.3% were “not sure.” (Table 23c).
4. 86.2% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the project director communicates regularly with the partner regarding the impact of the partner’s contributions”, 1.7% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 12.1% were “not sure.” (Table 23d).
5. All partners “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the after-school program is viewed as a helpful resource to families in the community.” (Table 23e).
6. 96.6% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the partner and grantee work together to effectively coordinate services for children, youth, and/or families”, 1.7% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 1.7% were “not sure.” (Table 23f).
7. All partners “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the after-school program is a significant asset in the community.” (Table 23g).

Executive Summary (Continued)

8. Regarding “how the partner contributes to the after-school program”, 13.8% donate money, 19.0% volunteer, 36.2% donate time, 36.2% donate materials, 39.7% teach a course, and 17.2% donate meeting space. (Table 23h).

MQIT

1. On a scale from 1 to 4 (1 denoting “must improve”, 2 “some progress”, 3 “satisfactory”, and 4 “excellent”) the highest to lowest ranked monitoring category (quality indicators) mean scores were: "staffing and professional development" (3.97), "programming/activities" (3.94), "center operations" (3.90), "health and safety" (3.88), "grant management and sustainability" (3.77), "partnerships" (3.70), "program management" (3.65), and "evaluation/measuring outcomes" (3.42). The overall mean score for all monitoring categories was 3.78. (Table 25a).

Program Strengths Based on MQIT Findings and Site Visits

1. CCLC grantees continued to identify and serve eligible students and their families consistent with the grant applications. Students/families benefited from an experienced and dedicated staff, long-tenured programs, and engaged day schools/staff and partners, among others. The staff and programs were committed to help their youth improve their chances for success.
2. Organizational structures were well defined, providing coordinators at each center to supervise staff and oversee daily programming. In many instances afterschool teachers were certified teachers.
2. Grantees provided a variety of evidence-based academic and enrichment programs/activities, many similar to those offered by the respective day-schools, including: math, reading, science, homework help, tutoring, computer and technology, music, arts and crafts, and recreational/field trip activities. Furthermore, learning opportunities continued to be progressive with numerous sites employing complementary evidence-based academic and enrichment activities such as: Readers Theatre, GEM Kits, KidzLit and KidzMath, Frog Publications, STEM Program Kits, Lakeshore Learning Science and Social Studies, Homeworkopoly, and Skillastics, among others. By and large, program activities were based on student need and commensurate with the age and skill level of the participants.
3. Academic and enrichment, programs/activities were highly structured and included detailed schedules/lesson plans/calendars. Programs provided appropriate schedules, flows, and duration of activities, etc.
5. Program staff continued to communicate and collaborate regularly with school-day personnel. As a rule, day school and afterschool teachers, either verbally and/or via written documentation, identified individuals needing assistance in particular academic areas. Grantees have made communications/collaborations among principals, teachers, site coordinators, and students a priority, resulting in improved communications/collaborations.

Executive Summary (Continued)

6. In general, staff was furnished comprehensive “Employee/Staff Handbooks”, while parents/families were provided comprehensive “Parent/Family Handbooks.” “Employee/Staff Handbooks” generally included sections such as: site-specific contact information; goals, confidentiality, vision statements, mission statements; academic and behavioral expectations; program confidentiality; employee pay schedules; job-specific performance review guidelines; proper dress; employment/job descriptions; child pick-up authorizations for parents/guardians; illness and subs; leave request form; community involvement; orientation; training; staff development; communication; meetings; newsletters; lesson plans; attendance; quarterly reports; safe environment; suspected child abuse/neglect; drills/safety measures; accidents/incidents (protocol); program fee base; and purchase order policies; among others. “Parent/Family Handbooks” for the most part included: program mission, program vision, program goals/objectives, program site information, program cost, holidays/storm day policies, release of students, visitor information, field trips, snacks, accident/illness, medications, responsible behavior, dismissal procedures, nondiscrimination/sexual harassment statements, access to student records, technology/computer/network facilities, staff/family partnership agreements, and field trip permission forms.
7. Grantees continued their commitment to conduct outreach to eligible participants by a variety of methods including: newsletters, letters to parents/families, open houses, PTO presentations, brochures, parent/family handbooks, invitations to programs/activities, DVD’s, and school-specific websites, among others.
8. In general, grantees conducted monthly meetings with project directors/site coordinators and staff, and in addition, many held regular meetings with school principals.
9. All grantees provided written sustainability plans which addressed issues should federal funding be discontinued or should school buildings no longer be eligible to receive funding.
10. Grantees made every effort to recruit and retain new partners, including a variety of public, private, and governmental sector agencies to address unmet needs.
11. School’s essential health and safety issues were generally adhered to as required. Specifically: safe spaces/areas for program activities, daily nutritional snacks, addressing unique health issues (such as allergies), clearly defined procedures for participant pick-ups, emergency contact information, readiness plans, fire/safety drills, internet access (firewall, etc.), universal precautions, and first aid/CPR trained staff.
12. In spite of numerous administrative staff turnover in particular regions and significant decisions regarding program involvement by key partners/subcontractors, grantees have done an exceptional job by continuing to strive for quality afterschool programs.

Executive Summary (Continued)

Opportunities for Program Improvement Based on MQIT Findings and Site Visits

1. Four or half of the CCLC program grantees lacked advisory boards, those typically comprised of parents, students, partners, and community member at large to provide advice and feedback. As in past years, this continues to be a promising opportunity not taken advantage of to improve the afterschool programs.
2. Nearly one-fifth (17.9% or 14) of the centers reported the mean number of hours per week as less than 15.
3. More than one-fifth (22.1% or 15) of the centers reported that 65.0% or less of their hours related to the core academic areas of mathematics, reading/literacy, science, and technology/computer. Furthermore, 12 centers failed to report any academic or enrichment hour programming times.
4. Various grantees continued to recognize that parent/family programming was limited and/or the perceived struggle with limited parental participation in the afterschool program's parent/family events.
5. Although not typical of most centers, in a few instances access to supplies for emergencies were not accessible after day school classes were dismissed. In addition, fire/safety drills were not conducted during afterschool program hours at all schools. Typically students in the afterschool programs are not "housed" in the same classrooms as they are during the regular school day.
6. Although a vast majority of grantees/sites continued to examine and update school safety policies/procedures, all grantee/centers in North Dakota are expected to reevaluate these periodically, taking into consideration the 2012 incident at the Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown Connecticut. The chief concern relates to individual(s) entering a school "unrecorded/ unchecked" by any day school or after school staff, potentially causing devastation.
7. More than one-third (37.2%) of the centers did not report State Assessment math proficiencies, while 37.5% did not report corresponding reading proficiencies. Furthermore, nearly half of the centers did not report any MAP math or MAP reading scores.
8. In many cases, YouthServices and SurveyMonkey-based stakeholder surveys were not conducted. In particular, 30 (37.5%) of the centers did not conduct YouthServices-based teacher surveys; 20 (25.0%) did not conduct SurveyMonkey-based teacher surveys; 29 (36.2%) parent surveys; and 24 (30.0%) student surveys. In addition, two of the eight grantees did not conduct partner surveys.
9. Moreover, a vast majority of the grantees who conducted the above mentioned surveys did not communicate results internally or to respective stakeholders. These stakeholders have an investment in programs and services and greatly influence what can and will be accomplished; consequently their input and providing feedback to them is critical in achieving successful outcomes. Effective feedback

also encourages stakeholders to buy-into the program, while lack or ineffective methods of feedback most often lead to program indifference

State Mandated Objectives/Progress

Objective 1: Participants in CCLC programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.

Performance Indicator 1.1 Achievement: Continuous improvement in test scores, grades, and/or teacher reports.

1. Mean fall MAP math scores were relatively constant throughout the 2008-09 to 2012-13 school years. During that time period, the mean scores rose slightly, from 193.2 in 2008-09 to 195.2 in 2012-13. Mean spring MAP math scores were also relatively constant throughout the 2008-09 to 2012-13 school years. During that time period, the scores rose slightly, from 201.3 in 2008-09 to 203.2 in 2012-13. Generally, mean scores were higher in the spring of each school year.
2. Mean fall MAP reading scores were relatively constant throughout the 2008-09 to 2012-13 school years. During that time period, the mean scores declined somewhat, from 198.4 in 2008-09 to 190.2 in 2012-13. Mean spring MAP reading scores were also relatively constant throughout the 2008-09 to 2012-13 school years. During that time period, the scores rose slightly, from 196.4 in 2008-09 to 197.4 in 2012-13. Generally, mean scores were higher in the spring of each school year.
3. With respect to state assessment math proficiencies, in 2008-09, 73.7% of attendees were “advanced” or “proficient” compared to 72.9% during the 2012-13 timeframe.
4. Regarding state assessment reading proficiencies, in 2008-09, 69.0% of attendees were “advanced” or “proficient” compared to 66.4% during the 2012-13 timeframe.
5. According to teacher’s, nearly two-thirds (62.9%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “turning in homework on time.”
6. Approximately two-thirds (64.6%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “completing their homework to the teachers satisfaction.”
7. Six of ten (59.8%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “participating in class.”
8. More than one-third (37.6%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “volunteering in class.”
9. Slightly more than half (51.5%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “being attentive in class.”

State Mandated Objectives/Progress (Continued)

10. Approximately two-thirds (67.9%) of attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “performing well academically.”
11. Slightly more than half (51.2%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “coming to school motivated to learn.”
12. Nearly three-fourths (74.1%) of parents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “as a result of participating in the after-school program, their child’s reading skills have improved.”
13. Roughly seven of ten (69.6%) parents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “as a result of participating in the after-school program, their child’s math skills have improved.”
14. Nearly two-thirds (63.6%) of the attendees indicated that “yes”, the “after school program helped improve their reading.”
15. Approximately two-thirds (67.4%) of the attendees reported that “yes”, the “after-school program helped improve their math skills.”

State Mandated Objectives/Progress (Continued)

Performance Indicator 1.2 Behavior: Improvements in attendance, classroom performance (other than grades) and number of disciplinary actions/adverse behaviors.

1. According to teachers, slightly more than one-third (34.1%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “attending class regularly.”
2. Approximately half (47.4%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “behaving well in class.”
3. Roughly half (47.6%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “getting along well with other students.”
4. Slightly more than three-fourths (75.5%) of parents indicated that they “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “as a result of participating in the after-school program, their child's attitude towards school has improved.”

Objective 2: CCLC will offer a range of high-quality educational, developmental and recreational services.

Performance Indicator 2.1 Core educational services: More than 65% of daily programming offered at each center will be of high quality in the core academic areas, e.g., reading and literacy, mathematics, science, and technology/computer.

1. Approximately three-fourths (77.9% or 53) of reporting sites indicated that more than 65.0% of their total hours involved the core academic areas of mathematics, reading/literacy, science, and technology/computer, while the remaining sites (22.1% or 15) reported 65.0% or less of their hours related to the core academic areas.

Performance Indicator 2.2 Enrichment and support activities: All Centers offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, and recreation.

1. Nearly all (97.1% or 68) of the reporting sites indicated providing enrichment and support activities, only two reported not providing such activities.

State Mandated Objectives/Progress (Continued)

Performance Indicator 2.3 Community involvement: All Centers establish and maintain partnerships within the community that continue to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing and sustaining programs.

1. Types of partners varied considerably and included Clubs, College or Universities, Community-Based Organizations, Faith-Based Organizations, For-Profit Entities, Health Based Organizations, Libraries, Museums, Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agencies, Other Unit of City/County Government, Park/Recreation Districts, Regional/Intermediate Education Agencies, School Districts, United States Department of Interior-Bureau of Indian Affairs, and YMCA's/YWCA's. All grantees reported partnerships with organizations.
2. Of the 152 partnerships reported statewide, 62.5% contributed "programming/activity-related services", 60.5% "goods/materials", 33.6% "paid staffing", and 26.3% "volunteer staffing."
3. Total estimated monetary value of contributions by partners was \$1,538,572.00, or a mean estimated monetary value of \$10,122.18 per partner. Of the total amount contributed by partners, 55.1% (\$847,921.00) was provided by "school districts."
4. A vast majority (98.3%) of partners "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that "they have good understanding of the goals of the after-school program."
5. Nearly all (96.6%) of the partners "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that "they have a good understanding about after-school program expectations of their contributions."
6. Roughly nine of ten (87.9%) of partners "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that "the project director communicates regularly with them regarding progress of the project."
7. More than eight of ten (86.2%) partners indicated they "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that "the project director communicates regularly with them regarding the impact of the partner's contributions."
8. All partners "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that "the after-school program is viewed as a helpful resource to families in the community."
9. A vast majority (96.6%) of partners "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that "they and grantee work together to effectively coordinate services for children, youth, and/or families."
10. All partners "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that "the after-school program is a significant asset in the community."

State Mandated Objectives/Progress (Continued)

11. All grantees provided written sustainability plans which addressed issues should federal funding be discontinued or should school buildings no longer be eligible to receive funding.

Performance Indicator 2.4 Services to families of eligible students: All Centers will offer services to families of eligible students.

1. More than one-third (37.5%) of reporting sites specified family members attended “promotion of parental involvement”, 21.3% “promotion of family literacy”, while 8.8% reported family members attended “career/job training for adults.”

Performance Indicator 2.5 Extended hours: All Centers will offer services at least 15 hours a week on average, and provide services when school is not in session, such as summer and holidays.

1. More than three-fourths (82.1% or 64) of all sites reported a mean number of hours per week as 15 or more, while 17.9% or 14 reported a mean of less than 15 hours per week.

Objective 3: CCLC will serve children and family members with the greatest needs for expanded learning opportunities.

Performance Indicator 3.1 High-need communities: All Centers will serve students that attend schools that are in need of improvement or are from schools that meet or exceed 40% free and reduced meals as defined by School Foods.

1. All sites served students that were in need of improvement.
2. Nearly all (95.0% or 76) of the reporting sites served attendees that met or exceeded 40% free/reduced meals, while four (5.0%) did not specify whether they met the 40% free and reduced meal criteria.

Recommendations for Program Improvement

Recommendations for CCLC program improvement are based on performance indicator goals and essential best practices, evidenced by observations made and information provided during the completion of the MQIT, site visits to centers (schools), and the analysis of data provided by grantees/centers via YouthServices.net, PPICS, and SurveyMonkey.

1. Performance indicator 1.1 specifies that CCLC attendees continually show improvement in test scores. In order to monitor changes in assessment test scores or proficiency levels test results must be reported by all grantees/centers. More than one-third (37.2%) of the centers did not report State Assessment math proficiencies, while 37.5% did not report corresponding reading proficiencies. Furthermore, nearly half of the centers did not report any MAP math or MAP reading scores.
 - Report student-specific MAP math and reading scores and state assessment math and reading proficiencies on a timely basis.
2. Performance indicator 2.1 stipulates that more than 65% of daily programming offered at each center will be of high quality in the core academic areas, e.g., reading and literacy, mathematics, science, and technology/computer. More than one-fifth (22.1% or 15) of the centers reported that 65.0% or less of their hours related to the core academic areas of mathematics, reading/literacy, science, and technology/computer. Furthermore, 12 centers failed to report any academic or enrichment hour programming times.
 - Develop and implement a strategic plan to meet or exceed the requirement that more than 65% of daily programming offered at each center will be of high quality in the core academic areas. Furthermore, to accurately measure if this requirement is being met, all centers must report the programming hours. The strategic plan should include assigning responsibility to an individual(s) to explore specific steps/options grantees/centers have available to meet the 65.0% requirement; decide on a timeframe when the specific steps/options need be completed; and examine and use the resources available to assist with the specific steps/options (Federal CCLC program staff, NDDPI, other grantees/centers, other states, etc.). At present, a quarterly monitoring report is disseminated to individual grantees. The purpose of the report is to observe whether each site is meeting the mandated objective that more than 65.0% of programming at each site is in the core academic areas of reading, math, science, and technology/computer.

Recommendations for Program Improvement (Continued)

3. Performance indicator 2.2 requires that all centers offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, and recreation. Only one of the reporting centers did not provide such activities. However, as indicated previously, 12 centers failed to report any academic or enrichment hour programming times.
 - Develop and implement a strategic plan to meet or exceed the requirement that all centers offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology and recreation. Furthermore, to accurately measure if this requirement is being met, all centers must report the programming hours. The strategic plan should include assigning responsibility to an individual(s) to explore specific steps/options grantees/centers have available to meet the all center requirement; decide on a timeframe when the specific steps/options need be completed; and examine and use the resources available to assist with the specific steps/options (Federal CCLC program staff, NDDPI, other grantees/centers, other states, etc.).
4. Performance indicator 2.4 stipulates that all centers will offer services to families of eligible students. Approximately one-third (37.5%) of reporting centers specified family members attended “promotion of parental involvement”, 21.3% “promotion of family literacy”, while 8.8% reported family members attended “career/job training for adults.” These numbers do not necessarily suggest that centers did not offer services to family members, rather a relatively few number of family members participated.
 - Develop and implement a strategic plan to meet the requirement that all centers offer services to families of eligible students. The strategic plan should include assigning responsibility to an individual(s) to explore specific steps/options grantees/centers have available to meet the family requirement; decide on a timeframe when the specific steps/options need be completed; and examine and use the resources available to assist with the specific steps/options (Federal CCLC program staff, NDDPI, other grantees/centers, other states, etc.).

Recommendations for Program Improvement (Continued)

5. Performance indicator 2.5 requires that all centers will offer services at least 15 hours a week on average, and provide services when school is not in session, such as summer and holidays. Nearly one-fifth (17.9%) of the centers reported a mean of less than 15 hours per week.
 - Develop and implement a strategic plan to meet or exceed the requirement that all centers will offer at least 15 hours a week on average. The strategic plan should include assigning responsibility to an individual(s) to explore specific steps/options grantees/centers have available to meet the 15 hour requirement; decide on a timeframe when the specific steps/options need be completed; and examine and use the resources available to assist with the specific steps/options (Federal CCLC program staff, NDDPI, other grantees/centers, other states, etc.). It should be noted that beginning with the 2013-14 school year the requirement has been revised to 12 hours a week, on average.
6. Performance indicator 3.1 specifies that all centers will serve students that attend schools that are in need of improvement or are from schools that meet or exceed 40% free and reduced meals as defined by School Foods. All centers served students that were in need of improvement, while nearly all (95.0%) of the reporting centers served attendees that met or exceeded 40% free/reduced meals. However, four centers failed to report if they served attendees that met or exceeded 40% free/reduced meals requirement.
 - Develop and implement a strategic plan to meet the requirement that all centers will serve students that attend schools that are in need of improvement or are from schools that meet or exceed 40% free and reduced meals. Furthermore, to accurately measure if this requirement is being met, all centers must report the 40% free/reduced meal data. The strategic plan should include assigning responsibility to an individual(s) to explore specific steps/options grantees/centers have available to meet the requirement; decide on a timeframe when the specific steps/options need be completed; and examine and use the resources available to assist with the specific steps/options (Federal CCLC program staff, NDDPI, other grantees/centers, other states, etc.).
7. Although a vast majority of grantees/sites continued to examine and update school safety policies/procedures, all grantee/centers in North Dakota are expected to reevaluate these periodically, taking into consideration the 2012 incident at the Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown Connecticut. The chief concern relates to individual(s) entering a school “unrecorded/ unchecked” by any day school or after school staff, potentially causing devastation.
 - Continue to examine and update school safety policies/procedures periodically.
8. Half (four of eight) of the grantees lacked an advisory board(s).
 - Establish an advisory board(s) that meets regularly and is comprised of parents, students, community member at large, and partners to provide advice and feedback.

Recommendations for Program Improvement (Continued)

9. In a few instances access to supplies for emergencies were not accessible after day school classes were dismissed. In addition, fire/safety drills were not conducted during afterschool program hours at all schools.
 - Allow access to supplies not accessible after day classes are dismissed.
 - Conduct fire/safety drills during afterschool hours at all centers.
10. YouthServices.net based teacher, student, parent, and partnership surveys were not conducted by all centers, in addition, nearly all of the grantees who conducted such surveys failed to communicate results internally and to respective stakeholders.
 - Carry out SurveyMonkey based teacher, student, parent, and partnership surveys using the existing standardized questionnaire formats, subsequently communicating the survey results internally and to respective stakeholders.
11. Although a sizeable number of grantees reported YouthServices.net based program attendance, activities/services, center operations, staffing, and partnership information, not all data was reported by all centers. The number and proportion of such grantees/centers is made available in each Table in the “Detailed Tables” section.
 - Such program information must be reported in a timely fashion for any center, region or state-specific assessments/evaluations to be straightforward. At present, missing data reports are disseminated to individual grantees quarterly. Grantees are expected to review the reports and populate any missing data.

Data Reporting and Interpretation Considerations

When examining the information made available in this report the reader should note the following:

1. In certain instances data relevant to the evaluation was not reported by all grantees/centers.
2. A sizable number of centers failed to report assessment test results; as a result, tests to measure statistically significant differences or changes in assessment test scores or proficiency levels were not conducted.
3. Changes in math and reading assessment mean scores or proficiency levels from one time period to another are not necessarily a direct result of the CCLC program. Numerous other factors may affect the changes in scores or proficiencies.
4. Math and reading assessments are not necessarily administered to the same grades year after year.
5. In some instances grantees may not have included homework help/tutoring hours spent with attendees in the core academic area of mathematics, reading/literacy, science, and technology/computer (assignments, problems, questions, etc.), consequently the number and proportion of hours relating to the core academic areas may be underreported.
6. Information used in the teacher, parent, student, and partner survey portions of this report are based on responses made by the respective stakeholders and may be subjective in nature, seeing as negative responses may be perceived to impact the CCLC program in an adverse manner.

Detailed Tables

Table 1

Grantees by Location and Number of Centers

All Grantees

2012-2013

Source: PPICS Individual Grantee Profile Summary - Data Submitted by Grantees

Grantee	Location	Number of Centers
GNWEC - Great Northwest Education Cooperative	Williston	12
MDEC - Mid-Dakota Education Cooperative	Minot	7
MREC/ESP - Missouri River Education Cooperative/Extended School Program	Mandan	9
NCEC - North Central Education Cooperative	Bottineau	10
NESC - Northeast Education Services Cooperative	Devils Lake	8
RESP - Roughrider Education Services Program	Dickinson	4
RRVEC - Red River Valley Education Cooperative	Grand Forks	14
SEEC - South East Education Cooperative	Fargo	16
Total		80

Table 2

Attendance by Gender and Attendee Status

All Grantees

2012-2013

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Downloaded PPICS Attendance Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Gender	All Attendees		Attendees (30+ days)		Attendees (<30 days)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	4,074	47.8%	2,583	49.2%	1,491	45.5%
Female	3,995	46.8%	2,504	47.7%	1,491	45.5%
Not stated	460	5.4%	162	3.1%	298	9.1%
Total	8,529	100.0%	5,249	100.0%	3,280	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 80 of 80 (100.0%)

Table 3**Attendance by Racial/Ethnic Groups and Attendee Status****All Grantees****2012-2013****Includes School Year and Summer Combined****Source: Downloaded PPICS Attendance Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees**

Racial/Ethnic Groups	All Attendees		Attendees (30+ days)		Attendees (<30 days)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
American Indian/Alaska Native	2,774	32.5%	1,267	24.1%	1,507	45.9%
Asian/Pacific Islander	73	0.9%	62	1.2%	11	0.3%
Black/African American	218	2.6%	170	3.2%	48	1.5%
Hispanic/Latino	412	4.8%	292	5.6%	120	3.7%
Native Hawaiian	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
White	4,624	54.2%	3,297	62.8%	1,327	40.5%
Not stated	428	5.0%	161	3.1%	267	8.1%
Total	8,529	100.0%	5,249	100.0%	3,280	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 80 of 80 (100.0%)

Table 4
Attendance by Grade Level and Attendee Status
All Grantees
2012-2013
Includes School Year and Summer Combined
Source: Downloaded PPICS Attendance Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Grade Level	All Attendees		Attendees (30+ days)		Attendees (<30 days)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Pre-K	16	0.2%	13	0.2%	3	0.1%
Kindergarten	963	11.3%	736	14.0%	227	6.9%
1st	1,219	14.3%	882	16.8%	337	10.3%
2nd	1,196	14.0%	855	16.3%	341	10.4%
3rd	1,202	14.1%	812	15.5%	390	11.9%
4th	1,114	13.1%	730	13.9%	384	11.7%
5th	922	10.8%	521	9.9%	401	12.2%
6th	484	5.7%	230	4.4%	254	7.7%
7th	321	3.8%	130	2.5%	191	5.8%
8th	283	3.3%	92	1.8%	191	5.8%
9th	107	1.3%	25	0.5%	82	2.5%
10th	79	0.9%	15	0.3%	64	2.0%
11th	55	0.6%	-	0.0%	55	1.7%
12th	31	0.4%	-	0.0%	31	0.9%
Not stated	537	6.3%	208	4.0%	329	10.0%
Total	8,529	100.0%	5,249	100.0%	3,280	100.0%

Table 5**Attendees Participating in Special Services or Programs****by Special Service or Program and Attendee Status****All Grantees****2012-2013****Includes School Year and Summer Combined****Source: Downloaded PPICS Attendance Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees**

	Attendees Participating in Special Service/Programs	Percent of all Attendees Participating in Special Service/Programs	Attendees Participating in Special Service/Programs (30+ days)	Percent of all Attendees Participating in Special Service/Programs	Attendees Participating in Special Service/Programs (<30 days)	Percent of all Attendees Participating in Special Service/Programs
Special Services or Programs	N	%	N	%	N	%
Limited English Proficiency (LEP)	452	6.1%	279	6.6%	173	5.4%
Free and Reduced Lunch Program (FRPL)	4,539	61.0%	2,699	63.5%	1,840	57.8%
Special Needs	846	11.4%	531	12.5%	315	9.9%

Number of centers reporting - 80 of 80 (100.0%)

8,529 total attendees

5,249 attendees (30+ days)

3,280 attendees (<30 days)

Table 6
Grantee Activity or Services Offered by Category of Activity or Service
All Grantees
2012-2013
Includes School Year Only
Source: Downloaded PPICS Activities by Category Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Category of Activity or Service	Number of Centers Providing Activity or Service During School Year	Percent of Centers Providing Activity or Service During School Year
Academic enrichment learning programs	79	98.8%
Tutoring	28	35.0%
Homework help	73	91.3%
Mentoring	8	10.0%
Recreational activities	53	66.3%
Drug/violence prevention, counseling, or character education	-	0.0%
Career job training for youth	9	11.3%
Expanded library service hours	5	6.3%
Supplemental education services	9	11.3%
Community service/service learning	19	23.8%
Activities to promote youth leadership	6	7.5%
Other (for students)	29	36.3%
Promotion of parental involvement	30	37.5%
Promotion of family literacy (family)	17	21.3%
Career/job training for adults (family)	7	8.8%

Number of centers reporting - 80 of 80 (100.0%)

Table 7

Grantee Centers Offering Activities or Services Focusing on a Given Academic Subject

by Academic Subject

All Grantees

2012-2013

Includes School Year Only

Source: Downloaded PPICS Activities by Subject Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Academic Subject	Number of Centers Providing Activity or Service During School Year	Percent of Centers Providing Activity or Service During School Year
Reading/literacy education activities	80	100.0%
Mathematics education activities	80	100.0%
Science education activities	78	97.5%
Arts and music education activities	61	76.3%
Entrepreneurial education programs	20	25.0%
Telecommunications and technology education activities	64	80.0%
Cultural activities/social studies	52	65.0%
Health/nutrition-related activities	67	83.8%
Other subjects	31	38.8%

Number of centers reporting - 80 of 80 (100.0%)

Table 8

Grantee Centers with Activities or Services Targeting a Given Population

All Grantees

Includes School Year Only

2012-2013

Source: Downloaded PPICS Activities Target Population Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Targeted Population	Number of Centers Targeting the Activity or Service During School Year	Percent of Centers Targeting the Activity or Service During School Year
Students not performing at grade level	64	79.0%
Limited English proficiency (LEP)	18	22.2%
Truant students	13	16.0%
Students with special needs	30	37.0%
Other student populations targeted	19	23.5%
Number of centers reporting - 80 of 80 (100.0%)		

Table 9
Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Core Academic Areas
(Mathematics, Reading/Literacy, Science, and Technology/Computer) by Grantee
2012-2013
Includes School Year and Summer Combined
Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees
Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

Grantee/Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Core Academic Areas	Percent Core Academic Areas
GNWEC Hagen	2,167.0	1,855.0	85.6%
GNWEC Lewis & Clark - Williston	290.3	162.3	55.9%
GNWEC McVay Elementary	241.5	118.0	48.9%
GNWEC Rickard Elementary School	458.5	274.4	59.8%
GNWEC St. Joseph's	301.8	195.3	64.7%
GNWEC Trinity Christian	193.5	130.7	67.6%
GNWEC Wilkensen	570.0	223.0	39.1%

Table 9 (Continued)

Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Core Academic Areas

(Mathematics, Reading/Literacy, Science, and Technology/Computer) by Grantee

2012-2013

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

Grantee/Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Core Academic Areas	Percent Core Academic Areas
MDEC Lewis & Clark - Minot	839.0	604.2	72.0%
MDEC McKinley Elementary - Minot	693.0	479.3	69.2%
MDEC Roosevelt Elementary - Minot	1,041.5	706.4	67.8%
MDEC Sunnyside Elementary	931.0	653.8	70.2%
MDEC Washington Elementary - Minot	1,176.8	788.0	67.0%

Table 9 (Continued)

**Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Core Academic Areas
(Mathematics, Reading/Literacy, Science, and Technology/Computer) by Grantee
2012-2013**

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

Grantee/Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Core Academic Areas	Percent Core Academic Areas
MREC Cannon Ball Elementary	138.8	92.5	66.7%
MREC Custer	964.5	460.3	47.7%
MREC Fort Lincoln	917.3	519.7	56.7%
MREC Mary Stark	985.0	523.5	53.1%
MREC Myhre Elementary	1,018.0	658.7	64.7%
MREC Riverside	788.0	475.8	60.4%
MREC Saxvik	1,016.5	614.6	60.5%
MREC Standing Rock (Ft Yates)	175.5	105.5	60.1%
MREC Will-Moore	983.5	679.3	69.1%

Table 9 (Continued)

**Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Core Academic Areas
(Mathematics, Reading/Literacy, Science, and Technology/Computer) by Grantee
2012-2013**

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

Grantee/Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Core Academic Areas	Percent Core Academic Areas
NCEC Anamoose	673.0	605.0	89.9%
NCEC Bottineau Elementary	481.5	218.0	45.3%
NCEC Dunseith	802.0	666.0	83.0%
NCEC Mt. Pleasant	353.0	296.2	83.9%
NCEC St. Ann's Catholic Indian School	371.5	256.2	69.0%
NCEC TGU Granville	541.0	417.2	77.1%
NCEC TGU Towner	963.5	507.8	52.7%
NCEC Turtle Mountain CS - Elementary	2,027.0	2,026.0	100.0%
NCEC Turtle Mountain CS Middle	787.0	648.7	82.4%

Table 9 (Continued)

**Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Core Academic Areas
(Mathematics, Reading/Literacy, Science, and Technology/Computer) by Grantee
2012-2013**

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

Grantee/Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Core Academic Areas	Percent Core Academic Areas
NESC Central Middle School	1,970.8	1,405.8	71.3%
NESC Minnewauken	413.0	343.0	83.0%
NESC Minnie H	539.0	429.3	79.6%
NESC Prairie View	803.8	579.8	72.1%
NESC Rolette	749.3	555.0	74.1%
NESC Sweetwater	853.5	530.9	62.2%
NESC Tata Topa Tribal School	959.0	931.0	97.1%
NESC Warwick	904.5	889.5	98.3%

Table 9 (Continued)

**Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Core Academic Areas
(Mathematics, Reading/Literacy, Science, and Technology/Computer) by Grantee
2012-2013**

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Core Academic Areas	Percent Core Academic Areas
RESP Heart River Elementary-Dickinson	426.5	331.0	77.6%
RESP Hebron Elementary	305.0	161.5	53.0%
RESP Lincoln Elementary - Beach	230.5	145.0	62.9%
RESP Roosevelt Elementary - Dickinson	503.0	380.5	75.6%

Table 9 (Continued)

**Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Core Academic Areas
(Mathematics, Reading/Literacy, Science, and Technology/Computer) by Grantee
2012-2013**

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

Grantee/Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Core Academic Areas	Percent Core Academic Areas
RRVEC Emerado Public Schools	521.0	415.3	79.7%
RRVEC Lake Agassiz - Grand Forks	467.8	327.0	69.9%
RRVEC Lewis & Clark - Grand Forks	585.0	422.0	72.1%
RRVEC Phoenix - Grand Forks	491.0	328.0	66.8%
RRVEC West - Grand Forks	491.0	328.0	66.8%
RRVEC Wilder Elementary	479.0	328.0	68.5%
RRVEC Winship - Grand Forks	490.8	328.0	66.8%
RRVEC Grafton Century Elementary	3,770.5	3,375.6	89.5%
RRVEC Grafton Middle School	800.0	800.0	100.0%
RRVEC Midway Public School	594.0	516.0	86.9%
RRVEC Northwood Public Schools	475.8	318.5	66.9%
RRVEC St. Thomas Public School	914.5	627.0	68.6%
RRVEC Walhalla Public School	495.0	477.0	96.4%

Table 9 (Continued)

**Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Core Academic Areas
(Mathematics, Reading/Literacy, Science, and Technology/Computer) by Grantee
2012-2013**

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

Grantee/Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Core Academic Areas	Percent Core Academic Areas
SEEC Barnes County North	292.0	231.0	79.1%
SEEC Fairmount Elementary	405.0	301.0	74.3%
SEEC Griggs County Central	722.5	576.0	79.7%
SEEC Jefferson Elementary	935.5	661.2	70.7%
SEEC LaMoure	385.0	289.0	75.1%
SEEC LE Berger Elementary	936.3	670.4	71.6%
SEEC Lincoln Elementary - Jamestown	493.0	339.3	68.8%
SEEC Louis L'Amour Elementary	495.0	347.2	70.1%
SEEC Madison Elementary	948.5	694.8	73.3%
SEEC McKinley Elementary - Fargo	672.5	464.7	69.1%
SEEC Midkota	363.5	274.3	75.4%
SEEC Roosevelt Elementary - Jamestown	497.5	346.0	69.5%
SEEC Washington Elementary - Jamestown	496.5	346.5	69.8%
Total all Grantees/Centers	49,766.0	36,775.0	73.9%

Number of centers reporting - 68 of 80 (85.0%)

Table 10
Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Enrichment and Support
Activities Including Arts/Music, Cultural/Social Studies, Health/Nutrition, and Other
by Grantee
2012-2013
Includes School Year and Summer Combined
Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees
Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

Grantee/Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Enrichment and Support Activities	Percent Enrichment and Support Activities
GNWEC Hagen	2,167.0	312.0	14.4%
GNWEC Lewis & Clark - Williston	290.3	128.0	44.1%
GNWEC McVay Elementary	241.5	123.5	51.1%
GNWEC Rickard Elementary School	458.5	184.1	40.2%
GNWEC St. Joseph's	301.8	106.5	35.3%
GNWEC Trinity Christian	193.5	62.8	32.4%
GNWEC Wilkensen	570.0	347.0	60.9%

Table 10 (Continued)

Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Enrichment and Support Activities Including Arts/Music, Cultural/Social Studies, Health/Nutrition, and Other

by Grantee

2012-2013

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

Grantee/Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Enrichment and Support Activities	Percent Enrichment and Support Activities
MDEC Lewis & Clark - Minot	839.0	234.8	28.0%
MDEC McKinley Elementary - Minot	693.0	213.8	30.8%
MDEC Roosevelt Elementary - Minot	1,041.5	335.1	32.2%
MDEC Sunnyside Elementary	931.0	277.3	29.8%
MDEC Washington Elementary - Minot	1,176.8	388.8	33.0%

Table 10 (Continued)

Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Enrichment and Support Activities Including Arts/Music, Cultural/Social Studies, Health/Nutrition, and Other

by Grantee

2012-2013

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

Grantee/Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Enrichment and Support Activities	Percent Enrichment and Support Activities
MREC Cannon Ball Elementary	138.8	46.3	33.3%
MREC Custer	964.5	504.3	52.3%
MREC Fort Lincoln	917.3	397.6	43.3%
MREC Mary Stark	985.0	461.5	46.9%
MREC Myhre Elementary	1,018.0	359.3	35.3%
MREC Riverside	788.0	312.3	39.6%
MREC Saxvik	1,016.5	401.9	39.5%
MREC Standing Rock (Ft Yates)	175.5	70.0	39.9%
MREC Will-Moore	983.5	304.3	30.9%

Table 10 (Continued)

Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Enrichment and Support Activities Including Arts/Music, Cultural/Social Studies, Health/Nutrition, and Other

by Grantee

2012-2013

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

Grantee/Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Enrichment and Support Activities	Percent Enrichment and Support Activities
NCEC Anamoose	673.0	68.0	10.1%
NCEC Bottineau Elementary	481.5	263.5	54.7%
NCEC Dunseith	802.0	136.0	17.0%
NCEC Mt. Pleasant	353.0	56.8	16.1%
NCEC St. Ann's Catholic Indian School	371.5	115.3	31.0%
NCEC TGU Granville	541.0	123.8	22.9%
NCEC TGU Towner	963.5	455.8	47.3%
NCEC Turtle Mountain CS - Elementary	2,027.0	1.0	0.0%
NCEC Turtle Mountain CS Middle	787.0	138.3	17.6%

Table 10 (Continued)

Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Enrichment and Support Activities Including Arts/Music, Cultural/Social Studies, Health/Nutrition, and Other

by Grantee

2012-2013

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

Grantee/Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Enrichment and Support Activities	Percent Enrichment and Support Activities
NESC Central Middle School	1,970.8	565.0	28.7%
NESC Minnewauken	413.0	70.0	16.9%
NESC Minnie H	539.0	109.7	20.4%
NESC Prairie View	803.8	224.0	27.9%
NESC Rolette	749.3	194.3	25.9%
NESC Sweetwater	853.5	322.6	37.8%
NESC Tata Topa Tribal School	959.0	28.0	2.9%
NESC Warwick	904.5	15.0	1.7%

Table 10 (Continued)

Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Enrichment and Support Activities Including Arts/Music, Cultural/Social Studies, Health/Nutrition, and Other

by Grantee

2012-2013

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Enrichment and Support Activities	Percent Enrichment and Support Activities
RESP Heart River Elementary-Dickinson	426.5	95.5	22.4%
RESP Hebron Elementary	305.0	143.5	47.0%
RESP Lincoln Elementary - Beach	230.5	85.5	37.1%
RESP Roosevelt Elementary - Dickinson	503.0	122.5	24.4%

Table 10 (Continued)

**Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Enrichment and Support Activities Including Arts/Music, Cultural/Social Studies, Health/Nutrition, and Other by Grantee
2012-2013**

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

Grantee/Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Enrichment and Support Activities	Percent Enrichment and Support Activities
RRVEC Emerado Public Schools	521.0	105.8	20.3%
RRVEC Lake Agassiz - Grand Forks	467.8	140.8	30.1%
RRVEC Lewis & Clark - Grand Forks	585.0	163.0	27.9%
RRVEC Phoenix - Grand Forks	491.0	163.0	33.2%
RRVEC West - Grand Forks	491.0	163.0	33.2%
RRVEC Wilder Elementary	479.0	151.0	31.5%
RRVEC Winship - Grand Forks	490.8	162.8	33.2%
RRVEC Grafton Century Elementary	3,770.5	394.9	10.5%
RRVEC Grafton Middle School	800.0	-	0.0%
RRVEC Midway Public School	594.0	78.0	13.1%
RRVEC Northwood Public Schools	475.8	157.3	33.1%
RRVEC St. Thomas Public School	914.5	287.5	31.4%
RRVEC Walhalla Public School	495.0	18.0	3.6%

Table 10 (Continued)

Number, Hours, and Percent of Hours of Centers Participating in Enrichment and Support Activities Including Arts/Music, Cultural/Social Studies, Health/Nutrition, and Other

by Grantee

2012-2013

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

Grantee/Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Enrichment and Support Activities	Percent Enrichment and Support Activities
SEEC Barnes County North	292.0	61.0	20.9%
SEEC Fairmount Elementary	405.0	104.0	25.7%
SEEC Griggs County Central	722.5	146.5	20.3%
SEEC Jefferson Elementary	935.5	274.3	29.3%
SEEC LaMoure	385.0	96.0	24.9%
SEEC LE Berger Elementary	936.3	265.9	28.4%
SEEC Lincoln Elementary - Jamestown	493.0	153.8	31.2%
SEEC Louis L'Amour Elementary	495.0	147.8	29.8%
SEEC Madison Elementary	948.5	253.7	26.8%
SEEC McKinley Elementary - Fargo	672.5	207.8	30.9%
SEEC Midkota	363.5	89.3	24.6%
SEEC Roosevelt Elementary - Jamestown	497.5	151.5	30.5%
SEEC Washington Elementary - Jamestown	496.5	150.0	30.2%
Total all Grantees/Centers	49,766.0	12,991.2	26.1%

Number of centers reporting - 68 of 80 (85.0%)

Table 11

Centers Providing 40% Free/Reduced Meals by Grantee

2012-2013

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Service Summary per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

Grantee	Total Centers	Total Centers Providing 40% Free/ Reduced Meal	Percent Total 40% Free/ Reduced Meal Attendees
GNWEC - Great Northwest Education Cooperative	12	8	66.7%
MDEC - Mid-Dakota Education Cooperative	7	7	100.0%
MREC/ESP - Missouri River Education Cooperative/Extended School Program	9	9	100.0%
NCEC - North Central Education Cooperative	10	10	100.0%
NESC - Northeast Education Services Cooperative	8	8	100.0%
RESP - Roughrider Education Services Program	4	4	100.0%
RRVEC - Red River Valley Education Cooperative	14	14	100.0%
SEEC - South East Education Cooperative	16	16	100.0%
Total	80	76	95.0%

Number of centers reporting - 76 of 80 (95.0%)

Note: Four of the GNWEC centers did not report whether they provided 40% free/reduced meals

Table 12
Mean Programming Hours per Week, Before Day School,
During Day School, After Day School, and Weekend
by Grantee
All Grantees
2012-2013
Includes School Year Only
Source: Downloaded PPICS Operations Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Grantee/Center	Mean Total Hours per Week & Weekend	Mean Total Hours per Week Before Day School	Mean Total Hours per Week During Day School	Mean Total Hours per Week After Day School	Mean Total Hours per Weekend
GNWEC Eight Mile Elementary School	15	2	-	13	-
GNWEC Four Bears	16	-	-	15	1
GNWEC Hagan Elementary School	15	-	-	15	-
GNWEC Lewis And Clark Elementary School	15	-	-	15	-
GNWEC Mandaree	15	-	-	15	-
GNWEC Parshall Bgc	15	-	-	15	-
GNWEC St. Josephs	15	-	-	15	-
GNWEC TAT	18	-	-	18	-
GNWEC Trinity Christian School	15	-	-	15	-
GNWEC Twin Buttes	15	-	-	15	-
GNWEC White Shield	15	-	-	15	-
GNWEC Wilkinson Elementary School	15	-	-	15	-

Table 12 (Continued)

Mean Programming Hours per Week, Before Day School,

During Day School, After Day School, and Weekend

by Grantee

All Grantees

2012-2013

Includes School Year Only

Source: Downloaded PPICS Operations Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Grantee/Center	Mean Total Hours per Week & Weekend	Mean Total Hours per Week Before Day School	Mean Total Hours per Week During Day School	Mean Total Hours per Week After Day School	Mean Total Hours per Weekend
MDEC Lewis & Clark Elementary School	24	9	-	15	-
MDEC Lincoln Elementary School	24	9	-	15	-
MDEC Mckinley Elementary School	24	9	-	15	-
MDEC Roosevelt Elementary School	24	9	-	15	-
MDEC Sawyer	17	-	-	17	-
MDEC Sunnyside Elementary School	24	9	-	15	-
MDEC Washington Elementary School	24	9	-	15	-

Table 12 (Continued)

Mean Programming Hours per Week, Before Day School,

During Day School, After Day School, and Weekend

by Grantee

All Grantees

2012-2013

Includes School Year Only

Source: Downloaded PPICS Operations Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Grantee/Center	Mean Total Hours per Week & Weekend	Mean Total Hours per Week Before Day School	Mean Total Hours per Week During Day School	Mean Total Hours per Week After Day School	Mean Total Hours per Weekend
MREC Custer Elementary School	15	5	-	10	-
MREC Ft Lincoln Elementary School	15	5	-	10	-
MREC Jeannette Myhre Elementary School	18	5	-	12	-
MREC Mary Stark Elementary School	15	5	-	10	-
MREC Riverside Elementary School	18	5	-	12	-
MREC Saxvik Elementary School	18	5	-	12	-
MREC Will- Moore Elementary School	18	5	-	12	-

Table 12 (Continued)

Mean Programming Hours per Week, Before Day School,

During Day School, After Day School, and Weekend

by Grantee

All Grantees

2012-2013

Includes School Year Only

Source: Downloaded PPICS Operations Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Grantee/Center	Mean Total Hours per Week & Weekend	Mean Total Hours per Week Before Day School	Mean Total Hours per Week During Day School	Mean Total Hours per Week After Day School	Mean Total Hours per Weekend
NCEC Anamoose Elementary School	15	5	-	6	4
NCEC Bottineau Elementary School	15	5		10	-
NCEC Dunseith Elementary School	12	5	-	8	-
NCEC Granville Elementary School	8	2	6	1	-
NCEC Mt Pleasant Elementary School	8	-	5	2	-
NCEC St. Ann'S Catholic School	8	2	6	-	-
NCEC Towner Elementary School	10	3	6	1	-
NCEC Turtle Mt Community Elem School	17	5	-	12	-
NCEC Turtle Mt Community Middle School	8	-	-	8	-
NCEC Velva	16	-	-	16	-

Table 12 (Continued)

Mean Programming Hours per Week, Before Day School,

During Day School, After Day School, and Weekend

by Grantee

All Grantees

2012-2013

Includes School Year Only

Source: Downloaded PPICS Operations Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Grantee/Center	Mean Total Hours per Week & Weekend	Mean Total Hours per Week Before Day School	Mean Total Hours per Week During Day School	Mean Total Hours per Week After Day School	Mean Total Hours per Weekend
NESC Central Middle School	18	6	-	12	-
NESC Minnewaukan Elementary School	15	7	-	8	-
NESC Minnie H Elementary School	15	8	-	8	-
NESC Prairie View Elementary School	15	5	-	10	-
NESC Rolette Elementary School	12	4	-	8	-
NESC Sweetwater Elementary School	15	7	-	8	-
NESC Tata Topa Elementary And Middle School	15	8	-	7	-
NESC Warwick Elementary School	15	6	-	9	-

Table 12 (Continued)

Mean Programming Hours per Week, Before Day School,

During Day School, After Day School, and Weekend

by Grantee

All Grantees

2012-2013

Includes School Year Only

Source: Downloaded PPICS Operations Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

	Mean Total Hours per Week & Weekend	Mean Total Hours per Week Before Day School	Mean Total Hours per Week During Day School	Mean Total Hours per Week After Day School	Mean Total Hours per Weekend
RESP Beach Elementary School	12	-	-	12	-
RESP Heart River Elementary School	15	-	-	15	-
RESP Hebron Elementary School	15	5	-	10	-
RESP Roosevelt Elementary School	15		-	15	-

Table 12 (Continued)**Mean Programming Hours per Week, Before Day School,****During Day School, After Day School, and Weekend****by Grantee****All Grantees****2012-2013****Includes School Year Only****Source: Downloaded PPICS Operations Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees**

Grantee/Center	Mean Total Hours per Week & Weekend	Mean Total Hours per Week Before Day School	Mean Total Hours per Week During Day School	Mean Total Hours per Week After Day School	Mean Total Hours per Weekend
RRVEC Century Elementary School	15	5	-	10	-
RRVEC Emerado Elementary School	15	5	-	10	-
RRVEC Grafton Central School	12	4	6	2	-
RRVEC Lake Agassiz Elementary School	15	-	-	15	-
RRVEC Lewis And Clark Elementary School	15	-	-	15	-
RRVEC Midway Elementary School	14	4	-	10	-
RRVEC Northwood Elementary School	15	8	-	8	-
RRVEC Park River Elementary School	15	5	-	10	-
RRVEC Phoenix Elementary School	15	-	-	15	-
RRVEC Saint Thomas Elementary School	8	2	-	6	-
RRVEC Walhalla Elementary School	20	8	-	12	-
RRVEC West Elementary School	15	-	-	15	-
RRVEC Wilder Elementary School	15	-	-	15	-
RRVEC Winship Elementary School	15	-	-	15	-

Table 12 (Continued)**Mean Programming Hours per Week, Before Day School,****During Day School, After Day School, and Weekend****by Grantee****All Grantees****2012-2013****Includes School Year Only****Source: Downloaded PPICS Operations Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees**

Grantee/Center	Mean Total Hours per Week & Weekend	Mean Total Hours per Week Before Day School	Mean Total Hours per Week During Day School	Mean Total Hours per Week After Day School	Mean Total Hours per Weekend
SEEC Fairmount Elementary	21	-	21	-	-
SEEC Fessenden-Bowdon	15	-	15	-	-
SEEC Griggs County Central	9	2	7	-	-
SEEC Jefferson Elementary	17	5	-	12	-
SEEC Lamoure	15	-	-	15	-
SEEC Le Berger Elementary	15	-	-	15	-
SEEC Lincoln Elementary School	17	5	-	12	-
SEEC Louis Lamour Elementary School	21	-	21	-	-
SEEC Madison Elementary	8	1	5	2	-
SEEC McKinley Elementary	21	-	21	-	-
SEEC Midkota	15	-	-	15	-
SEEC North Central Of Barnes	15	8	-	8	-
SEEC Roosevelt Elementary	14	-	14	-	-
SEEC Roosevelt Elementary-Jmst	22	-	22	-	-
SEEC Washington Elementary School	16	3	-	12	-
SEEC Wimbledon-Courtenay School	15	5	-	10	-

Number of centers reporting - 78 of 80 (97.5%)

Table 13a
Paid and Volunteer Staff by Type and Percent of Type
All Grantees
2012-2013
Includes School Year and Summer Combined
Source: Downloaded PPICS Staffing Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Staff Type	Total Staff N	Paid Staff N	Volunteer Staff N	Total Staff %	Paid Staff %	Volunteer Staff %
School-day teachers	359	357	2	33.5%	41.1%	1.0%
College students	220	174	46	20.5%	20.0%	22.4%
High school students	150	58	92	14.0%	6.7%	44.9%
Parents	3	2	1	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%
Youth development workers	78	72	6	7.3%	8.3%	2.9%
Other community members	59	5	54	5.5%	0.6%	26.3%
Other non-teaching school staff	96	93	3	8.9%	10.7%	1.5%
Other non-day school staff with some or no college	26	26	-	2.4%	3.0%	0.0%
Center administrators and coordinators	82	81	1	7.6%	9.3%	0.5%
Total	1,073	868	205	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 78 of 80 (97.5%)

Table 13b
Paid and Volunteer Staff by Type and Percent of Paid/Volunteer
All Grantees
2012-2013
Includes School Year and Summer Combined
Source: Downloaded PPICS Staffing Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Staff Type	Total Staff N	Paid Staff N	Volunteer Staff N	Paid Staff %	Volunteer Staff %
School-day teachers	359	357	2	99.4%	0.6%
College students	220	174	46	79.1%	20.9%
High school students	150	58	92	38.7%	61.3%
Parents	3	2	1	66.7%	33.3%
Youth development workers	78	72	6	92.3%	7.7%
Other community members	59	5	54	8.5%	91.5%
Other non-teaching school staff	96	93	3	96.9%	3.1%
Other non-day school staff with some or no college	26	26	-	100.0%	0.0%
Center administrators and coordinators	82	81	1	98.8%	1.2%
Total	1,073	868	205	80.9%	19.1%

Number of centers reporting - 78 of 80 (97.5%)

Table 14

Partners/Subcontractors by Contribution Type

All Grantees

2012-2013

Includes School Year and Summer Combined

Source: Downloaded PPICS Partners Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Contribution Type	Number of Partners Contributing	Number of Subcontractors Contributing	Percent of Partners Contributing	Percent of Subcontractors Contributing
Evaluation Services	15	1	9.9%	6.7%
Funding/Raised Funds	37	3	24.3%	20.0%
Programming/Activity-Related Services	95	7	62.5%	46.7%
Goods/Materials	92	13	60.5%	86.7%
Volunteer Staffing	40	1	26.3%	6.7%
Paid Staffing	51	13	33.6%	86.7%
Other	35	9	23.0%	60.0%
Total	152	15		

Number of grantees reporting - 8 of 8 (100.0%)

Total partners - 152

Total subcontractors - 15

Total estimated monetary value of contributions by partners - \$1,538,572

Mean estimated monetary value of contributions per partner - \$10,122.18

Total estimated monetary value of subcontracts held by subcontractors - \$1,397,377

Mean estimated monetary value of subcontracts held by subcontractors per subcontractor - \$93,158.47

Table 15
Type of Partner by Contribution
All Grantees
2012-2013
Includes School Year and Summer Combined
Source: Downloaded PPICS Partners Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Type of Partner	Partners N	Partners %	Total Contributions	Percent of Total Contributions
Club	3	2.0%	\$ 42,150.00	2.7%
College or University	16	10.5%	\$ 24,535.00	1.6%
Community-Based Organization	20	13.2%	\$ 528,051.00	34.3%
Faith-Based Organization	3	2.0%	\$ 4,600.00	0.3%
For-Profit Entity	16	10.5%	\$ 33,250.00	2.2%
Health Based Organization	4	2.6%	\$ 1,750.00	0.1%
Library	2	1.3%	\$ 4,000.00	0.3%
Museum	2	1.3%	\$ 1,700.00	0.1%
Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agency	12	7.9%	\$ 20,111.00	1.3%
Other	8	5.3%	\$ 5,900.00	0.4%
Other Unit of City/County Government	8	5.3%	\$ 5,102.00	0.3%
Park/Recreation District	4	2.6%	\$ 3,501.00	0.2%
Regional/Intermediate Education Agency	5	3.3%	\$ 14,001.00	0.9%
School District	45	29.6%	\$ 847,921.00	55.1%
United States Department of Interior-Bureau of Indian Affairs	2	1.3%	\$ 1,100.00	0.1%
YMCA/YWCA	2	1.3%	\$ 900.00	0.1%
Total	152	100.0%	\$ 1,538,572.00	100.0%

Number of grantees reporting - 8 of 8 (100.0%)

Total partners - 152

Table 16
MAP Math and MAP Reading Mean Scores
and Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported Scores
by Test Timeframe and Test Type
2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013
Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Test Timeframe	MAP Math Mean Scores	MAP Reading Mean Scores	Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported MAP Math Results	Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported MAP Reading Results
Fall (08-09)	193.2	189.4	2,739	2,791
Spring (08-09)	201.3	196.4	3,563	3,489
Fall (09-10)	193.1	188.7	2,080	2,069
Spring (09-10)	203.6	197.5	3,281	3,503
Fall (10-11)	194.5	188.4	3,433	3,169
Spring (10-11)	201.0	195.2	3,205	3,048
Fall (11-12)	193.1	189.2	3,684	3,512
Spring (11-12)	203.1	198.1	3,755	3,785
Fall (12-13)	195.2	190.2	3,021	3,019
Spring (12-13)	203.2	197.4	3,147	3,271

Number of centers reporting math scores (Fall 12-13) - 45 of 80 (56.3%)

Number of centers reporting math scores (Spring 12-13) - 49 of 80 (61.3%)

Number of centers reporting reading scores (Fall 12-13) - 45 of 80 (56.3%)

Number of centers reporting reading scores (Spring 12-13) - 52 of 80 (65.0%)

Table 17
State Assessment Math Proficiencies
and Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported Proficiencies
by Test Timeframe
2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013
Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Proficiency	Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported Proficiencies					Percent of CCLC Attendees with Reported Proficiencies				
	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13
Advanced	293	431	499	540	390	17.4%	19.4%	20.0%	22.2%	18.1%
Proficient	946	1,234	1,397	1,315	1,177	56.3%	55.6%	56.1%	54.1%	54.8%
Partially Proficient	306	402	392	380	386	18.2%	18.1%	15.7%	15.6%	18.0%
Novice	136	151	203	197	196	8.1%	6.8%	8.1%	8.1%	9.1%
Total	1,681	2,218	2,491	2,432	2,149	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Number of centers reporting math proficiencies (2012-13) - 51 of 80 (63.8%)

Table 18
State Assessment Reading Proficiencies
and Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported Proficiencies
by Test Timeframe
2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013
Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Proficiency	Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported Proficiencies					Percent of CCLC Attendees with Reported Proficiencies				
	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13
Advanced	274	280	330	379	295	16.5%	13.1%	13.1%	15.7%	14.1%
Proficient	872	1,222	1,441	1,229	1,094	52.5%	57.2%	57.4%	50.9%	52.3%
Partially Proficient	367	454	500	541	504	22.1%	21.2%	19.9%	22.4%	24.1%
Novice	147	181	240	265	199	8.9%	8.5%	9.6%	11.0%	9.5%
Total	1,660	2,137	2,511	2,414	2,092	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Number of centers reporting reading proficiencies (2012-13) - 50 of 80 (62.5%)

Table 19a

Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question

All Grantees

2012-2013

Source: Downloaded Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database

YouthServices - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Of the 5,261 total teacher surveys disseminated, 3,163 or 60.1% were completed and returned.

To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of:

1. Turning in homework on time.

Improvement Scale	All Attendees	
	N	%
Significant Improvement	327	18.0%
Moderate Improvement	341	18.8%
Slight Improvement	474	26.1%
No Change	528	29.1%
Slight Decline	87	4.8%
Moderate Decline	35	1.9%
Significant Decline	24	1.3%
Total	1,816	100.0%
Total above excludes the "Did Not Need to Improve" attendees.	1,311	

Number of centers reporting - 50 of 80 (62.5%)

Table 19b
Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question
All Grantees
2012-2013
Source: Downloaded Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database
YouthServices - Data Submitted by Grantees

To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of:
 2. Completing homework to your (teachers) satisfaction.

Improvement Scale	All Attendees N	%
Significant Improvement	336	17.6%
Moderate Improvement	413	21.7%
Slight Improvement	482	25.3%
No Change	498	26.1%
Slight Decline	109	5.7%
Moderate Decline	45	2.4%
Significant Decline	22	1.2%
Total	1,905	100.0%
Total above excludes the "Did Not Need to Improve" attendees.	1,225	

Number of centers reporting - 50 of 80 (62.5%)

Table 19c
Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question
All Grantees
2012-2013
Source: Downloaded Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database
YouthServices - Data Submitted by Grantees

To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of:
 3. Participating in class.

Improvement Scale	All Attendees N	%
Significant Improvement	169	9.1%
Moderate Improvement	367	19.8%
Slight Improvement	569	30.8%
No Change	648	35.0%
Slight Decline	56	3.0%
Moderate Decline	31	1.7%
Significant Decline	9	0.5%
Total	1,849	100.0%
Total above excludes the "Did Not Need to Improve" attendees.	1,313	

Number of centers reporting - 50 of 80 (62.5%)

Table 19d
Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question
All Grantees
2012-2013
Source: Downloaded Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database
YouthServices - Data Submitted by Grantees

To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of:
 4. Volunteering in class.

Improvement Scale	All Attendees N	%
Significant Improvement	112	6.4%
Moderate Improvement	201	11.5%
Slight Improvement	342	19.6%
No Change	1,041	59.8%
Slight Decline	27	1.5%
Moderate Decline	11	0.6%
Significant Decline	8	0.5%
Total	1,742	100.0%
Total above excludes the "Did Not Need to Improve" attendees.	1,387	

Number of centers reporting - 50 of 80 (62.5%)

Table 19e
Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question
All Grantees
2012-2013
Source: Downloaded Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database
YouthServices - Data Submitted by Grantees

To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of:
 5. Attending class regularly.

Improvement Scale	All Attendees N	%
Significant Improvement	94	8.4%
Moderate Improvement	95	8.5%
Slight Improvement	191	17.1%
No Change	649	58.2%
Slight Decline	52	4.7%
Moderate Decline	21	1.9%
Significant Decline	14	1.3%
Total	1,116	100.0%
Total above excludes the "Did Not Need to Improve" attendees.	2,046	

Number of centers reporting - 50 of 80 (62.5%)

Table 19f
Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question
All Grantees
2012-2013
Source: Downloaded Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database
YouthServices - Data Submitted by Grantees

To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of:
 6. Being attentive in class.

Improvement Scale	All Attendees N	%
Significant Improvement	140	7.0%
Moderate Improvement	301	15.1%
Slight Improvement	585	29.4%
No Change	750	37.6%
Slight Decline	137	6.9%
Moderate Decline	54	2.7%
Significant Decline	26	1.3%
Total	1,993	100.0%
Total above excludes the "Did Not Need to Improve" attendees.	1,168	

Number of centers reporting - 50 of 80 (62.5%)

Table 19g
Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question
All Grantees
2012-2013
Source: Downloaded Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database
YouthServices - Data Submitted by Grantees

To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of:
 7. Behaving well in class.

Improvement Scale	All Attendees N	%
Significant Improvement	122	6.8%
Moderate Improvement	234	13.1%
Slight Improvement	492	27.5%
No Change	701	39.2%
Slight Decline	161	9.0%
Moderate Decline	54	3.0%
Significant Decline	24	1.3%
Total	1,788	100.0%
Total above excludes the "Did Not Need to Improve" attendees.	1,373	

Number of centers reporting - 50 of 80 (62.5%)

Table 19h
Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question
All Grantees
2012-2013
Source: Downloaded Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database
YouthServices - Data Submitted by Grantees

To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of:
 8. Performing well academically.

Improvement Scale	All Attendees N	%
Significant Improvement	252	11.9%
Moderate Improvement	471	22.3%
Slight Improvement	713	33.7%
No Change	512	24.2%
Slight Decline	101	4.8%
Moderate Decline	43	2.0%
Significant Decline	22	1.0%
Total	2,114	100.0%
Total above excludes the "Did Not Need to Improve" attendees.	1,047	

Number of centers reporting - 50 of 80 (62.5%)

Table 19i
Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question
All Grantees
2012-2013
Source: Downloaded Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database
YouthServices - Data Submitted by Grantees

To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of:
 9. Coming to school motivated to learn.

Improvement Scale	All Attendees N	%
Significant Improvement	141	8.1%
Moderate Improvement	276	15.9%
Slight Improvement	470	27.1%
No Change	716	41.3%
Slight Decline	69	4.0%
Moderate Decline	41	2.4%
Significant Decline	19	1.1%
Total	1,732	100.0%
Total above excludes the "Did Not Need to Improve" attendees.	1,430	

Number of centers reporting - 50 of 80 (62.5%)

Table 19j
Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question
All Grantees
2012-2013
Source: Downloaded Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database
YouthServices - Data Submitted by Grantees

To what extent has this student changed his/her behavior in terms of:
 10. Getting along well with other students.

Improvement Scale	All Attendees N	%
Significant Improvement	145	8.7%
Moderate Improvement	221	13.3%
Slight Improvement	423	25.5%
No Change	688	41.5%
Slight Decline	133	8.0%
Moderate Decline	31	1.9%
Significant Decline	17	1.0%
Total	1,658	100.0%
Total above excludes the "Did Not Need to Improve" attendees.	1,502	

Number of centers reporting - 50 of 80 (62.5%)

Table 20a
Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question
All Grantees
2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 2a

I have a good understanding of the goals of the after-school program.

	N	%
Strongly Agree	183	29.7%
Agree	336	54.5%
Not Sure	74	12.0%
Disagree	14	2.3%
Strongly Disagree	10	1.6%
Total	617	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 60 of 80 (75.0%)

Table 20b

Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question

All Grantees

2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 2b

I have a good understanding about the after-school program expectations of my contributions.

	N	%
Strongly Agree	174	28.2%
Agree	302	48.9%
Not Sure	107	17.3%
Disagree	25	4.1%
Strongly Disagree	9	1.5%
Total	617	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 60 of 80 (75.0%)

Table 20c
Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question
All Grantees
2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 2c

Program staff communicate regularly with school day staff to inform us about program operations.

	N	%
Strongly Agree	163	26.4%
Agree	253	41.0%
Not Sure	107	17.3%
Disagree	73	11.8%
Strongly Disagree	21	3.4%
Total	617	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 60 of 80 (75.0%)

Table 20d

Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question

All Grantees

2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 2d

Program staff communicate regularly with school day staff to receive information about student progress.

	N	%
Strongly Agree	120	19.4%
Agree	261	42.3%
Not Sure	119	19.3%
Disagree	91	14.7%
Strongly Disagree	26	4.2%
Total	617	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 60 of 80 (75.0%)

Table 20e

Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question

All Grantees

2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 2e

The program activities addressing academic and behavioral needs of the students are well designed.

	N	%
Strongly Agree	154	25.0%
Agree	291	47.2%
Not Sure	131	21.2%
Disagree	23	3.7%
Strongly Disagree	18	2.9%
Total	617	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 60 of 80 (75.0%)

Table 20f
Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question
All Grantees
2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 2f

The program activities addressing academic and behavioral needs of students are implemented effectively.

	N	%
Strongly Agree	140	22.7%
Agree	279	45.2%
Not Sure	151	24.5%
Disagree	31	5.0%
Strongly Disagree	16	2.6%
Total	617	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 60 of 80 (75.0%)

Table 21a**Parent Survey Results by Individual Question****All Grantees****2012-2013****Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Parent Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees**

Question 2

What are the most important reasons for having your child participate in the after-school program?

(Note: 1 denotes most important while 5 denotes least important)

Reasons	1 (Most Important)	2	3	4	5 (Least Important)	Total Responses	Mean Response (1)
Safe Setting	259	339	170	186	169	1,123	2.70
Helps With Childcare	384	191	166	154	228	1,123	2.69
Improves Academic Performance	208	207	335	197	175	1,122	2.93
Improves Behavior in and out of School	136	179	221	268	319	1,123	3.41
Improves Attitude Towards School	136	207	231	318	231	1,123	3.27
Safe Setting	23.1%	30.2%	15.1%	16.6%	15.0%	100.0%	
Helps With Childcare	34.2%	17.0%	14.8%	13.7%	20.3%	100.0%	
Improves Academic Performance	18.5%	18.4%	29.9%	17.6%	15.6%	100.0%	
Improves Behavior in and out of School	12.1%	15.9%	19.7%	23.9%	28.4%	100.0%	
Improves Attitude Towards School	12.1%	18.4%	20.6%	28.3%	20.6%	100.0%	

(1) Note: The lower the mean response (score), the more important the reason for participation.

Number of centers reporting - 51 of 80 (63.8%)

Table 21b**Parent Survey Results by Individual Question****All Grantees****2012-2013****Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Parent Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees****Question 3a**

As a result of participating in the after-school program, my child's reading skills have improved?

	N	%
Strongly Agree	315	28.0%
Agree	517	46.0%
Not Sure	247	22.0%
Disagree	35	3.1%
Strongly Disagree	9	0.8%
Total	1,123	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 51 of 80 (63.8%)

Table 21c

Parent Survey Results by Individual Question

All Grantees

2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Parent Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 3b

As a result of participating in the after-school program, my child's math skills have improved?

	N	%
Strongly Agree	302	26.9%
Agree	480	42.7%
Not Sure	296	26.4%
Disagree	35	3.1%
Strongly Disagree	10	0.9%
Total	1,123	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 51 of 80 (63.8%)

Table 21d

Parent Survey Results by Individual Question

All Grantees

2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Parent Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 3c

As a result of participating in the after-school program, my child's attitude towards school has improved?

	N	%
Strongly Agree	320	28.5%
Agree	528	47.0%
Not Sure	225	20.0%
Disagree	42	3.7%
Strongly Disagree	8	0.7%
Total	1,123	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 51 of 80 (63.8%)

Table 21e

Parent Survey Results by Individual Question

All Grantees

2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Parent Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 3d

The after-school program provides a safe setting for my child
to participate in activities?

	N	%
Strongly Agree	799	71.1%
Agree	297	26.4%
Not Sure	17	1.5%
Disagree	3	0.3%
Strongly Disagree	7	0.6%
Total	1,123	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 51 of 80 (63.8%)

Table 21f

Parent Survey Results by Individual Question

All Grantees

2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Parent Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 3e

Overall, I am very satisfied with the after-school program for
which my child participates?

	N	%
Strongly Agree	819	72.9%
Agree	268	23.9%
Not Sure	16	1.4%
Disagree	11	1.0%
Strongly Disagree	9	0.8%
Total	1,123	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 51 of 80 (63.8%)

Table 21g**Parent Survey Results by Individual Question****All Grantees****2012-2013****Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Parent Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees**

Question 3f

Overall, my child is very satisfied with the after-school program?

	N	%
Strongly Agree	746	66.4%
Agree	313	27.9%
Not Sure	33	2.9%
Disagree	21	1.9%
Strongly Disagree	10	0.9%
Total	1,123	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 51 of 80 (63.8%)

Table 22
Student Survey Results by Individual Question
All Grantees
2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Student Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Questions	Yes	Not Sure	No	Total Responses
Has the after school program helped you improve your reading?	1,704	371	603	2,678
Has the after-school program helped you improve your math skills?	1,796	401	468	2,665
Do you like attending the after-school program?	2,037	287	339	2,663
Has the after school program helped you improve your reading?	63.6%	13.9%	22.5%	100.0%
Has the after-school program helped you improve your math skills?	67.4%	15.0%	17.6%	100.0%
Do you like attending the after-school program?	76.5%	10.8%	12.7%	100.0%
Number of centers reporting - 56 of 80 (70.0%)				

Table 23a
Partner Survey Results by Individual Question
All Grantees
2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Partnership Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 1a

I have a good understanding of the goals of the after-school program?

	N	%
Strongly Agree	30	51.7%
Agree	27	46.6%
Not Sure	1	1.7%
Disagree	-	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	-	0.0%
Total	58	100.0%

Number of grantees reporting - 6 of 8 (75.0%)

Table 23b

Partner Survey Results by Individual Question

All Grantees

2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Partnership Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 1b

I have a good understanding about after-school program expectations of my contributions?

	N	%
Strongly Agree	32	55.2%
Agree	24	41.4%
Not Sure	2	3.4%
Disagree	-	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	-	0.0%
Total	58	100.0%

Number of grantees reporting - 6 of 8 (75.0%)

Table 23c

Partner Survey Results by Individual Question

All Grantees

2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Partnership Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 1c

Project director communicates regularly with me regarding progress of the project?

	N	%
Strongly Agree	25	43.1%
Agree	26	44.8%
Not Sure	6	10.3%
Disagree	1	1.7%
Strongly Disagree	-	0.0%
Total	58	100.0%

Number of grantees reporting - 6 of 8 (75.0%)

Table 23d

Partner Survey Results by Individual Question

All Grantees

2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Partnership Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 1d

Project director communicates regularly with me regarding the impact of my contributions?

	N	%
Strongly Agree	23	39.7%
Agree	27	46.6%
Not Sure	7	12.1%
Disagree	1	1.7%
Strongly Disagree	-	0.0%
Total	58	100.0%

Number of grantees reporting - 6 of 8 (75.0%)

Table 23e

Partner Survey Results by Individual Question

All Grantees

2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Partnership Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 1e

The after-school program is viewed as a helpful resource to families in the community?

	N	%
Strongly Agree	48	82.8%
Agree	10	17.2%
Not Sure	-	0.0%
Disagree	-	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	-	0.0%
Total	58	100.0%

Number of grantees reporting - 6 of 8 (75.0%)

Table 23f

Partner Survey Results by Individual Question

All Grantees

2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Partnership Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 1f

We work together to effectively coordinate services for children, youth, and/or families?

	N	%
Strongly Agree	35	60.3%
Agree	21	36.2%
Not Sure	1	1.7%
Disagree	1	1.7%
Strongly Disagree	-	0.0%
Total	58	100.0%

Number of grantees reporting - 6 of 8 (75.0%)

Table 23g
Partner Survey Results by Individual Question
All Grantees
2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Partnership Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 1g

The after-school program is a significant asset in our community?

	N	%
Strongly Agree	50	86.2%
Agree	8	13.8%
Not Sure	-	0.0%
Disagree	-	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	-	0.0%
Total	58	100.0%

Number of grantees reporting - 6 of 8 (75.0%)

Table 23h

Partner Survey Results by Individual Question

All Grantees

2012-2013

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Partnership Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question 2

How does your organization contribute to the after-school program?

	N	%
Donate Money	8	13.8%
Volunteer	11	19.0%
Donate Time	21	36.2%
Donate Materials	21	36.2%
Teach a Course	23	39.7%
Provide Tutors	3	5.2%
Donate Meeting Space	10	17.2%
Other	14	24.1%
Total Respondents	58	

Number of grantees reporting - 6 of 8 (75.0%)

Table 24
Centers Serving Improvement Schools by Grantee and Improvement School
All Grantees
2012-2013
Sources: PPICS Full Grantee APR - Data Submitted by Grantees
and NDDPI Title I Program Improvement Schools

Grantee/Center	Improvement School the Center is Serving
GNWEC Hagan Elementary School	Hagan Elementary School – Williston
GNWEC Lewis And Clark Elementary School	Lewis and Clark Elementary School – Williston
GNWEC Wilkinson Elementary School	Wilkinson Elementary School – Williston
GNWEC Eight Mile Elementary School	Eight Mile Elementary School
GNWEC St. Josephs	Not an Improvement School
GNWEC Trinity Christian School	Not an Improvement School
GNWEC TAT	Not an Improvement School
GNWEC White Shield	White Shield Elementary School
GNWEC Twin Buttes	Twin Buttes Elementary School
GNWEC Parshall BGC	Parshall Elementary School
GNWEC Mandaree	Mandaree Elementary School
GNWEC Four Bears	Not an Improvement School
MDEC Lincoln Elementary School	Not an Improvement School
MDEC Lewis & Clark Elementary School	Lewis and Clark Elementary School – Minot
MDEC Roosevelt Elementary School	Roosevelt Elementary School – Minot
MDEC Sunnyside Elementary School	Sunnyside Elementary School – Minot
MDEC Mckinley Elementary School	McKinley Elementary School – Minot
MDEC Washington Elementary School	Washington Elementary School – Minot
MDEC Sawyer	Sawyer Elementary School

Table 24 (Continued)**Centers Serving Improvement Schools by Grantee and Improvement School****All Grantees****2012-2013****Sources: PPICS Full Grantee APR - Data Submitted by Grantees
and NDDPI Title I Program Improvement Schools**

Grantee/Center	Improvement School the Center is Serving
MREC/ESP Jeannette Myhre Elementary School	Jeannette Myhre Elementary School – Bismarck
MREC/ESP Riverside Elementary School	No longer a school
MREC/ESP Saxvik Elementary School	Saxvik Elementary School – Bismarck
MREC/ESP Will- Moore Elementary School	Will-Moore Elementary School – Bismarck
MREC/ESP Custer Elementary School	Not an Improvement School
MREC/ESP Ft Lincoln Elementary School	Ft. Lincoln Elementary School – Mandan
MREC/ESP Mary Stark Elementary School	Mary Stark Elementary School – Mandan
MREC/ESP Fort Yates Elementary School	Fort Yates Elementary School
MREC/ESP Cannon Ball Elementary School	Cannon Ball Elementary School
NCEC Bottineau Elementary School	Bottineau Elementary School
NCEC Anamoose Elementary School	Not an Improvement School
NCEC Turtle Mt Community Middle School	Turtle Mountain Community Middle School – Belcourt
NCEC Dunseith Elementary School	Dunseith Elementary School
NCEC Mt Pleasant Elementary School	Mt. Pleasant Elementary School
NCEC Towner Elementary School	TGU Towner Elementary School
NCEC Granville Elementary School	TGU Granville Elementary
NCEC St. Ann's Catholic School	Not an Improvement School
NCEC Turtle Mt Community Elem School	Turtle Mountain Elementary School – Belcourt
NCEC Velva	Velva Elementary School
NESC Central Middle School	Not an Improvement School
NESC Minnie H Elementary School	Not an Improvement School
NESC Prairie View Elementary School	Prairie View Elementary School – Devils Lake
NESC Sweetwater Elementary School	Not an Improvement School
NESC Minnewaukan Elementary School	Minnewaukan Elementary School
NESC Warwick Elementary School	Warwick Elementary School
NESC Rolette Elementary School	Rolette Elementary School
NESC Tata Topa Elementary and Middle School	Not an Improvement School

Table 24 (Continued)

Centers Serving Improvement Schools by Grantee and Improvement School

All Grantees

2012-2013

**Sources: PPICS Full Grantee APR - Data Submitted by Grantees
and NDDPI Title I Program Improvement Schools**

Grantee/Center	Improvement School the Center is Serving
RESP Heart River Elementary School	Heart River Elementary School – Dickinson
RESP Roosevelt Elementary School	Roosevelt Elementary School – Dickinson
RESP Beach Elementary School	Not an Improvement School
RESP Hebron Elementary School	Not an Improvement School
RRVEC Emerado Elementary School	Emerado Elementary School
RRVEC Lake Agassiz Elementary School	Lake Agassiz Elementary School – Grand Forks
RRVEC Lewis And Clark Elementary School	Not an Improvement School
RRVEC West Elementary School	West Elementary School – Grand Forks
RRVEC Wilder Elementary School	Not an Improvement School
RRVEC Winship Elementary School	Winship Elementary School – Grand Forks
RRVEC Phoenix Elementary School	Phoenix Elementary School – Grand Forks
RRVEC Northwood Elementary School	Not an Improvement School
RRVEC Saint Thomas Elementary School	St. Thomas Elementary School
RRVEC Midway Elementary School	Midway Elementary School
RRVEC Park River Elementary School	Not an Improvement School
RRVEC Century Elementary School	Not an Improvement School
RRVEC Walhalla Elementary School	Not an Improvement School
RRVEC Grafton Central School	Grafton Central Middle School

Table 24 (Continued)

Centers Serving Improvement Schools by Grantee and Improvement School

All Grantees

2012-2013

**Sources: PPICS Full Grantee APR - Data Submitted by Grantees
and NDDPI Title I Program Improvement Schools**

Grantee/Center	Improvement School the Center is Serving
SEEC Griggs County Central	Not an Improvement School
SEEC North Central Of Barnes	Not an Improvement School
SEEC Midkota	Midkota Elementary School – Binford
SEEC Wimbledon-Courtenay School	Not an Improvement School
SEEC Washington Elementary School	Not an Improvement School
SEEC Lincoln Elementary School	Lincoln Elementary School – Fargo
SEEC Lamoure	Not an Improvement School
SEEC Fessenden-Bowdon	Fessenden-Bowdon Elementary School
SEEC Le Berger Elementary	L.E. Berger Elementary School – West Fargo
SEEC Madison Elementary	Madison Elementary School – Fargo
SEEC Fairmount Elementary	Not an Improvement School
SEEC McKinley Elementary	Not an Improvement School
SEEC Jefferson Elementary	Jefferson Elementary School – Fargo
SEEC Roosevelt Elementary	Not an Improvement School
SEEC Louis Lamour Elementary School	Not an Improvement School
SEEC Roosevelt Elementary-Jmst	Not an Improvement School
SEEC Roosevelt Horace Mann	Not an improvement school
SEEC Washington Elementary - Jamestown	Not an improvement school
SEEC Wimbledon-Courtenay	Not an improvement school

Number of centers reporting - 80 of 80 (100.0%)

Table 25a
Mean Scores by Monitoring and Quality Improvement Tool (MQIT) Category
All Regions Combined
2012-2013
Source: MQIT

MQIT Categories	Excellent	Satisfactory	Some Progress	Must Improve	Mean Score
A. Grant Management and Sustainability	89	7	7	1	3.77
B. Program Management	61	4	-	7	3.65
C. Staffing and Professional Development	62	2	-	-	3.97
D. Partnerships	33	3	3	1	3.70
E. Center Operations	36	4	-	-	3.90
F. Programming/Activities	45	3	-	-	3.94
G. Health and Safety	70	10	-	-	3.88
H. Evaluation/Measuring Outcomes	33	5	7	3	3.42
All MQIT Categories Combined	429	38	17	12	3.78

Table 25b
Mean Scores for Grants Management and Sustainability
by Performance Measure (Best Practice)
All Regions Combined
2012-2013
Source: MQIT

Grants Management and Sustainability MQIT Categories	Expect. Met	Expect. Met W/Rec.	Partially Met	Not Met	Mean Score
1. Identified and is serving eligible students and their families.	8	-	-	-	4.00
2. Is conducting outreach to eligible participants.	7	-	1	-	3.75
3. Is providing the number of hours of programming.	4	1	3	-	3.13
4. Is implementing the evidence-based academic and enrichment activities.	8	-	-	-	4.00
5. Is implementing the parent/family programming or activities.	5	2	1	-	3.50
6. Is addressing the transportation needs of children.	8	-	-	-	4.00
7. Houses the program in a safe and accessible facility.	6	2	-	-	3.75
8. Is making adequate progress toward meeting goals and objectives.	7	1	-	-	3.88
9. Has developed a sustainability plan and has made efforts to gain other funding, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
10. Staff has attended the required state 21st CCLC meetings.	7	-	1	-	3.75
11. Maintains appropriate documentation for employees of the grant program.	8	-	-	-	4.00
12. Program works in genuine collaboration with at least one partner.	8	-	-	-	4.00
13. Participates as requested in the state monitoring and evaluation process.	5	1	1	1	3.25
Grants Management and Sustainability MQIT Categories Only	89	7	7	1	3.77

Table 25c
Mean Scores for Grantee Program Management
by Performance Measure (Best Practice)
All Regions Combined
2012-2013
Source: MQIT

Program Management MQIT Categories	Excellent	Satisfactory	Some Progress	Must Improve	Mean Score
1. Organizational structure is well defined and sound. The program has site coordinator.	8	-	-	-	4.00
2. The program has written policies and procedures specific to its operations.	8	-	-	-	4.00
3. Student/staff ratio is appropriate and safe for the specific activity conducted/meets needs.	8	-	-	-	4.00
4. Program holds regular staff and partnership meetings that are more than admin. In nature.	6	1	-	1	3.50
5. Program volunteers are screened and trained effectively.	8	-	-	-	4.00
6. Program staff communicates and collaborates regularly with school-day personnel, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
7. Program employs an effective marketing strategy to publicize program and achievements.	5	2	-	1	3.38
8. Program maintains on-going documentation of contributions (in-kind or resources).	6	1	-	1	3.50
9. Program has an advisory board (community, parents, etc) that meets regularly.	4	-	-	4	2.50
Program Management MQIT Categories Only	61	4	-	7	3.65

Table 25d
Mean Scores for Grantee Staffing and Professional Development
by Performance Measure (Best Practice)
All Regions Combined
2012-2013
Source: MQIT

Staffing and Professional Development MQIT Categories	Excellent	Satisfactory	Some Progress	Must Improve	Mean Score
1. Project Director and program staff are highly qualified.	8	-	-	-	4.00
2. Program selects staff members based on prior experience, qualifications, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
3. Program completes appropriate background checks for all staff.	8	-	-	-	4.00
4. Staff is sensitive to the culture and language of participants.	8	-	-	-	4.00
5. Staff has competence in core academic areas for an afterschool environment.	8	-	-	-	4.00
6. Staff is trained in program policies/procedures. Staff is aware of program goals, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
7. Program assesses training needs of staff (and school and community partners), etc.	6	2	-	-	3.75
8. Staff and volunteers are evaluated on a regular basis, etc	8	-	-	-	4.00
Staffing and Professional Development MQIT Categories Only	62	2	-	-	3.97

Table 25e
Mean Scores for Grantee Partnerships
by Performance Measure (Best Practice)
All Regions Combined
2012-2013
Source: MQIT

Partnership MQIT Categories	Excellent	Satisfactory	Some Progress	Must Improve	Mean Score
1. Program makes efforts to recruit new and retain established partners, etc.	7	-	1	-	3.75
2. Program partners are aware of the program goals and objective, etc.	7	-	1	-	3.75
3. Program regularly communicates with and seeks input from its partners, etc.	5	1	1	1	3.25
4. Program has established linkages with other state, federal and local agencies, etc.	7	1	-	-	3.88
5. The program enters formal written agreements with subcontractors.	7	1	-	-	3.88
Partnership MQIT Categories Only	33	3	3	1	3.70

Table 25f
Mean Scores for Grantee Center Operations
by Performance Measure (Best Practice)
All Regions Combined
2012-2013
Source: MQIT

Center Operations MQIT Categories	Excellent	Satisfactory	Some Progress	Must Improve	Mean Score
1. Program's hours, activity schedules, and locations are available, accessible, etc.	7	1	-	-	3.88
2. Program activities and services are promoted in the targeted schools, etc.	7	1	-	-	3.88
3. Program has adopted clear standards for student behavior and attendance, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
4. Program effectively communicates standards for student behavior to students/parents.	8	-	-	-	4.00
5. Program encourages parent involvement in decision-making, etc.	6	2	-	-	3.75
Center Operations MQIT Categories Only	36	4	-	-	3.90

Table 25g
Mean Scores for Grantee Programming/Activities
by Performance Measure (Best Practice)
All Regions Combined
2012-2013
Source: MQIT

Programming/Activities MQIT Categories	Excellent	Satisfactory	Some Progress	Must Improve	Mean Score
1. Program activities reflect the goals and mission of the program.	7	1	-	-	3.88
2. Program provides evidence-based academic support and enrichment activities, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
3. Program addresses the academic, physical, social and emotional needs of students, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
4. Program activities are selected based on student needs and interests, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
5. Program has an appropriate schedule, flow, and duration of activities, etc.	7	1	-	-	3.88
6. Program accommodates students with special needs/ELL, etc.	7	1	-	-	3.88
Programming/Activities MQIT Categories Only	45	3	-	-	3.94

Table 25h
Mean Scores for Grantee Health and Safety
by Performance Measure (Best Practice)
All Regions Combined
2012-2013
Source: MQIT

Health and Safety MQIT Categories	Excellent	Satisfactory	Some Progress	Must Improve	Mean Score
1. Program activities occur in spaces that are adequate, appropriate, and safe, etc.	5	3	-	-	3.63
2. Program provides daily nutritional snacks during program operation, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
3. Program addresses any unique health needs of students, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
4. Program follows established procedures for authorized student pick-ups, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
5. Emergency contact information for students and staff is maintained/easily accessible, etc.	7	1	-	-	3.88
6. Program has adopted an emergency readiness plan and has provided notice, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
7. Internet use for academic or enrichment activities, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
8. Staff trained in first aid and CPR, etc.	7	1	-	-	3.88
9. Program conducts all required fire/safety drills.	6	2	-	-	3.75
10. Program has adequate security in place.	5	3	-	-	3.63
Health and Safety MQIT Categories Only	70	10	-	-	3.88

Table 25i
Mean Scores for Grantee Evaluation/Measuring Outcomes
by Performance Measure (Best Practice)
All Regions Combined
2012-2013
Source: MQIT

Evaluation/Measuring Outcomes MQIT Categories	Excellent	Satisfactory	Some Progress	Must Improve	Mean Score
1. Program has adopted and applies an evaluation process to measure program goals, etc.	5	2	1	-	3.50
2. Evaluation process includes requesting feedback from stakeholders, etc.	5	-	3	-	3.25
3. Program uses the information for decision making, etc.	5	1	2	-	3.38
4. Evaluation findings are regularly and effectively communicated to staff, collaborators, etc.	3	2	-	3	2.63
5. Program also collects photos and stories about program impact, etc.	7	-	1	-	3.75
6. Program identifies and shares promising practices internally, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
Evaluation/Measuring Outcomes MQIT Categories Only	33	5	7	3	3.42

Number of grantees reporting - 8 of 8 (100.0%)